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The emerging perceptions of nationhood and spirituality in the prayers of the Early Slavs and of Kievan Rus’ within their literary context

This study explores the evolving identity of the Slavs, particularly of Kievan Rus’, as perceived in the prayers written by Slavs in the ninth to twelfth centuries.

Chapter I examines the so-called Alphabetical prayer, commonly attributed to Konstantin of Preslav, as an early expression of Slavonic literature, celebrating the linking of the Slavonic language with the language of the Gospels and indeed with the *logos*. Chapters II and III focus on Kievan Rus’ and consider how the literary prayers embedded in the accounts of the conversion and baptism of Vladimir I, and also those concerning the martyrdom of Princes Boris and Gleb, raise these events from the level of prosaic and politically motivated incidents to the level of sacred events of national life. Chapter IV investigates the prayer attributed to Ilarion, placed in connection with the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, as a prayer spoken on behalf of the whole people, which impresses on them the identity of Rus’ united first and foremost by their new-found faith. In chapter V, works on Feodosii are shown to exemplify an intercessor’s monastic perspective, while chapter VI explores how Vladimir Monomakh writes his *Pouchenie* as a prince and layman, laying a moral foundation through prayer, in particular aimed at the factious princes of Rus’. The final chapter examines how Kirill of Turov’s weekly prayer cycle portrays the interior spiritual world.

As well as tracing the evolving nationhood and spirituality of Rus’, this study throws light on scholarly debates surrounding the original context of some of the prayers. In contexts as diverse as a narrative of a *vita* to a prologue of a commentary, prayers are seen to function dynamically within their wider setting.

In a period when written evidence is comparatively scarce, prayers offer a further perspective on the emerging identity and spirituality of Kievan Rus’. The evident care with which prayers were written and placed in significant contexts should help to alert the reader to the importance of prayers in early Slavonic literature in general.
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Editorial Notes

When quoting from a printed source, I have generally followed the characters and punctuation of the edition ('ё', however, is not distinguished from 'ё', diacritic marks are not included and several characters are missing from the font, namely ь, ы). When quoting from manuscripts or copies and facsimiles of manuscripts, punctuation is added in order to facilitate reading, while retaining idiosyncratic orthography and obvious mistakes. Generally the titlo is printed in full and the letters inserted are then italicized (if the edition indicates the titlo). In the footnotes, however, letters which comprise a titlo are not always italicized.

For works which are given a title in the original, the modern Russian rendering is transliterated or, alternatively, a commonly accepted form of the title is used. In cases where works have been given a title centuries later by scholars, for example the 'azbuchnaia molitva' or the 'Iaroslav sbornik', they are translated into English and italicized, hence the Alphabetical prayer and the Iaroslav miscellany.

Names are given in a form which is commonly used or transliterated according to the Library of Congress system, and without diacritics.

Slavonic quotations from the Psalter are cited with references which follow the numbering of the Septuagint, while quotations in English are given according to the edition used.

In quotations certain words or letters may appear in bold to highlight a point that has just been made. These do not reflect a different lettering in the original text.
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Introduction

In the past, literary critics have regularly ignored Slavonic prayers, regarding them as stale and unoriginal in both style and content. As a result there is a paucity of literary criticism on prayers considered as an integral part of the Slavonic literary heritage. The majority of studies on prayers to date tend to concentrate on textual questions regarding individual prayers.

---

1 Fennell has little time for the opening of Nestor’s Zhitie Feodosiia and comments that it begins ‘with a standard, tedious introduction crammed with self-denigration, quotations and prayers’ (John Fennell and Antony Stokes, Early Russian Literature, London, 1974, pp.32-3).

2 One notable exception is Gerhard Podskalsky’s article which gives an overview of the prayers of Kievan Rus’. See G. Podskalsky, ‘Das Gebet in der Kiever Rus’: seine Formen, seine Rolle, seine Aussagen’, Orthodoxes Forum 2, 2, 1988, pp.177-91. Articles on individual prayers are primarily devoted to a) the so-called Alphabetical prayer, commonly ascribed to Konstantin of Preslav; b) the prayer attached to the end of Ilarion’s Slovo o zakone i blagodati, and c) prayers attributed to Kirill of Turov. Questions of authorship and textology tend to dominate discussions of these prayers.

---


c) For textual study and comment on Kirill’s prayers see Kirill von Turov. Gebete. Nach der Ausgabe in Pravoslavny sobesednik 1858, repr. Dm. Tschiżewskij (ed.), (Slavische Propyläen 6), Munich, 1965; and for a recent study made in preparation for a new edition of Kirill’s weekly
Yet for the original writers themselves, and for those to whom the works were addressed, prayers represented a bond with reality outside time which influenced the course of events and affected the way they interpreted them.

Prayer is a surprisingly fluid category. How should prayer be defined? An extended answer to this question belongs to the inquiry of the philosopher and theologian. For the purpose of this study which considers Christian prayer, it is sufficient to say that prayer is invariably linked to some kind of belief in God or a venerated figure. This assumes a perceived relationship between the suppliant and the one addressed, so that the character ascribed to God or to other venerated figures will clearly influence the expression and purpose given to prayer. Here the meeting of theology and experience is unavoidable, the practice of prayer becoming inseparable from the theory.

Who prays and how people pray are open-ended questions. Unlike the work of the preacher, the hymn writer or the commentator, which in the
past tended to be the domain of a minority, prayer potentially includes the illiterate and women and children. With regard to how people pray, Christian tradition accepts prayers made with or without words, prayers communicated in silence or aloud, and prayers uttered spontaneously or by rote. Prayer is confined neither to a holy place nor a formal service, nor a particular time, but according to St Paul is to be made continually and in all circumstances.\(^5\) Prayers can be said individually and communally, accompanied by physical movement or in a motionless posture.\(^6\) This present study is concerned with only one aspect of prayer, namely prayer in its recorded, literary form.

Like the concept and practice of prayer itself, literary prayers are harder to define than may at first appear. As well as the formal prayer characterized by its opening invocation and its final 'amen', prayer may be recorded as a simple remark directed to God or to other venerated figures. A prayer may be expressed as a momentary cry for help, a plea for forgiveness, or an exclamation of praise. Prayers are found as set pieces in prayer books designed for recitation by succeeding generations, as well as in narratives, where they purport to represent the unspoken or spoken prayers which marked a particular occasion. Many religious works, for example the sermon, commentary, or \textit{vita}, are framed by prayers. Thus literary prayers are seen to inhabit a bewildering variety of forms and contexts.

Considered as literature, prayers do not fit into a traditional system of genres. Gail Lenhoff, reflecting a disenchantment with conventional literary categories vis-à-vis early Russian literature found among Western scholars, advocates an approach which perceives a literary work according

\(^5\) See 1 Thessalonians 5:17
to its ‘Sitz im Leben’. She remarks that it is misleading to apply literary genres to early literary works since ‘pre-Petrine writings are generated primarily by extra-literary socio-cultural systems’. However, as has been discussed above, prayers cannot be limited exclusively to a recognized set of functions, and therefore they require an even broader understanding. In this respect it is helpful to take a leaf out of Biblical scholarship. Prayers of the Old and New Testament occur in a variety of settings, both as ‘set’ prayers and as prayers in narratives. The Psalter, for example, contains highly structured prayers (even though it can be debated whether they should be called prayers, songs, or meditations, or a mixture of two or three of these categories), while in other narratives, prayer occurs in the form of a conversation with God. While the prayers/songs of the Psalter are sometimes given a special heading, prayers included in Biblical narratives are not indicated by specialized terminology but can be signalled simply by the verb ‘to say’. Thus in relation to this study, it seems reasonable to define literary prayers in the wider sense, following a Biblical model as literary records of communication with God, and, in the light of the Orthodox tradition, with other figures of veneration. These incorporate formal prayers, remarks directed to God, prayerful meditations and motifs of intercession.

Literary prayers were among the first translated material to reach the Slavs. In the Vita Constantini St Cyril is depicted as translating the Gospels and other liturgical books. Although hagiographers were prone to

---

8 For the problem of definition and the Psalter see Paul J. Achtemeier et al. (eds), Harper’s Bible Dictionary, New York, 1985, p.833 and J.Clinton McCann (ed.), The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter, Sheffield, 1993.
9 Patrick Miller, They Cried to the Lord. The Form and Theology of Biblical Prayer, Minneapolis, 1994, examines how in the Old Testament prayer is signalled by verbs of saying, seeking, asking and inquiring. He comments that the language of prayer ‘designates prayer as an occurrence in the midst of the affairs of life and without special accoutrements, simply as human communication with the divine’ (p.47).
10 Вякне же са во свь нужнем чине преможи, и нариц а брежни, и гласами, оглажди, и вечери, и покровици и тымы служе’ Р. Латов, Materialy po istorii vozniknovenia drevneishei...
exaggerate the speed and quantity of material translated, it can be assumed that the brothers Cyril and Methodius saw this task as a key to the success of their mission in Moravia.

While the Christian faith allows scope for spontaneity and lack of structure in personal prayer, the liturgy offered the Slavs a comprehensive, if complex, system of prayer. In addition to special prayer books, for example the Euchologion (trebnik) and the Psalter, much of the liturgy is permeated with texts of prayers. There are prayers to mark the annual, weekly and hourly cycle of the Church's calendar. The liturgy includes prayers designed for lay and monastic use, for individual and corporate worship. Whether people were sitting down to a meal, or starting a job, whether the country was facing natural disaster or giving thanks for the harvest, suitable prayers could be found in the prayer books. Three traditionally key events of human life - birth, marriage and death - are explained and expressed through prayers included in the relevant offices.

Far from representing a static corpus of works, the liturgy evolved from its beginnings in the Early Church. While the services of the Holy Liturgy became fixed in the early centuries after the Church was officially recognized by the Roman Empire, prayer books, in particular, remained open to addition and change through the centuries. Thus the liturgy


13 Dom G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, London, 1945, suggests that from a single model of eucharistic worship, different rites, for example the Syrian and Egyptian rites, emerged in the third and fourth centuries with a greater degree of standardization occurring when the Church gained imperial recognition. See also John Meyendorff's chapter 'Liturgy' in The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church, New York, 1982, pp.116-28. He comments that the Byzantine
provided both an axis of stability for the Church, as well as a point of potentially deep division. Because the liturgy was seen as embodying the Church’s dogma, attempts to introduce changes in the ritual, particularly those affecting the Holy Liturgy, tended to arouse implacable opposition.14

For writings on the theory and practice of prayer, the early Church could turn to the Scriptures as well as to apostolic writings.15 The third century saw a number of key works devoted more specifically to the subject of prayer, notably Origen’s treatise on the subject.16 Even when prayer was not the main focus, writings attributed to other Church Fathers, such as Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom, contain numerous comments relating to prayer and set out the theology which would shape the perception of prayer.17 It is not easy to ascertain how many or which parts of patristic works were translated early into Slavonic, and therefore exactly what was available in Kievan Rus’. Certainly some of the more mystical works on prayer such as Evagrius Ponticus’ De oratione and John Climacus’ Scala paradisi were included in the corpus of translated works.18 In general, patristic works translated in the

liturgy was on the one hand highly conservative, being perceived as the test of true orthodoxy and the preserve of the ‘Great Church’. On the other hand, he also notes the development of hymnography in the eighth and ninth centuries and of the introduction of practices from the Typikon of St Sabbas during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. For a discussion of the use of the psalms, especially the communion psalms see D. Conomos, ‘The late Byzantine and Slavonic communion cycle: liturgy and music’, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 21, 1985, pp.3-18.


16 Within fifty years three major works had appeared on prayer, namely Tertullian’s De Oratione, Origen’s Treatise on Prayer and Cyprian’s De Oratione. For a useful introduction to literature on prayer and an English translation of Origen’s work see Eric George Jay (tr. & intro.), Origen’s Treatise on Prayer, London, 1954.


Kievan period tended to concentrate on how to pray, rather than on a philosophical discussion of the nature and purpose of prayer. It was only after the Mongol invasion and the rise of Muscovy, that native Slav writers such as Nil of Sora composed treatises devoted specifically to prayer. During the fourteenth century, the practice of hesychasm, which advocated the prayer of the heart or prayer of the mind, gained popularity throughout the Orthodox world. Increasingly hesychasm became associated with the repetition of the Jesus prayer, generating considerable interest in a more mystical understanding of prayer. The Philokalia (Dobroliubie), a collection of writings dating from between the third and fifteenth centuries devoted specially to prayer, was translated into Slavonic in the eighteenth century and profoundly influenced the perception of prayer in Russia.

By comparison with these later developments, the writers of Kievan Rus' would have been guided primarily by the Scriptures and the prayers of the liturgy in forming their perception of prayer. This study looks not at theories about prayer and its practice, but rather confines itself predominantly to notable prayers attributed to the early Slav writers in Bulgaria and in Rus'.

The choice of prayers is determined mainly by three factors: first, the material that is extant, second, probable Slav authorship of a prayer, and third, the contribution each prayer makes to a perception of nationhood and spirituality. The first point is an obvious one but here it is worth restating as the field of research is circumscribed by the scarcity of material in the first centuries of Slavonic writing. Rather than fixing criteria by which to select

---


21 This collection was first compiled in the eighteenth century by two Greek monks, St Nicodemus and St Macarius and was published in Venice in 1782. Paisii Velichkovskii, a Russian monk who visited Mt Athos, translated a selection of texts from the Philokalia into Slavonic and it was published in Moscow in 1793. For an English translation see G.E.H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard & Kallistos Ware (tr. & ed.), The Philokalia, I, London, 1979.
material, here the material dictates to a large degree what criteria can be applied.\(^{22}\)

The themes of nationhood and spirituality are two subjects of current interest. Since the resurgence of national awareness in the countries of the former USSR, numerous articles and books have been coming off the academic press devoted to the concept of nationhood and national identity.\(^{23}\) Of course, in comparison with a study of a contemporary phenomenon, the phenomenon of nationhood as reflected in early Slav prayers differs enormously in its fundamental conception and historical context. The term nationhood, and the related words nation and national, might at first sight appear anachronistic when applied to Rus'. On careful reflection, however, this term is appropriate.\(^{24}\)

Firstly, it is important to emphasize that by using the term nation in relation to the Middle Ages, I am neither trying to undermine its contemporary usage, nor ignore its relevance as a historical phenomenon that surfaced with particular verve (or one could say, virulence) at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Because there is no one definition of a ‘nation’, it is standard practice to offer a definition at the beginning of an article or book. For the purposes of this study, nationhood is a useful term which defines a group of people, in this instance the inhabitants of Rus’, who occupy a certain territory and cultivate a sense

---

\(^{22}\) Likewise, Halperin, in his study of the concept of the ‘russkaia zemlia’, notes that in medieval Rus’ there was little in the way of theoretical treatises on political thought, so that in lieu phrases, concepts and titles become important evidence. See C.J. Halperin, ‘The concept of the “Russkaia Zemlia” and medieval national consciousness from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries’, Nationalities Papers, 8, 1980, 1, p.75.

\(^{23}\) For example Rogers Brugbaker, Nationalism reframed, nationhood and the national question in the New Europe, Cambridge, 1996. D.S. Likhachev’s book, Natsional'noe samosoznanie drevnei Rusi, Moscow-Leningrad, 1945, discusses the evolving national identity of Rus’ in relation to the hypothetical ‘svody’, which he argues forms the basis of the Primary Chronicle. It is perhaps not without significance that Likhachev chose to publish on this topic in 1945 when questions of nationhood were at the forefront of international concern.

\(^{24}\) The word *natio* (deriving from the Latin *nasci* - to be born) was employed in the Middle Ages more generally as a synonym for *gens*, and was also used in a narrow sense to designate the quarters in a medieval university occupied by students from a particular country (Susan Reynolds, Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300, Oxford, 1984).
of solidarity and common culture under the authority of a recognized ruler or rulers. In the case of the people of Rus' they can be seen to perceive themselves as bound together by a common language, religion, rule, history, culture and territory. Though the use of alternative words for nationhood, such as 'peoplehood' or 'community', are less controversial, they fail to convey the distinctive identity which resides in such a group. In addition, the word nation reinforces a sense of continuity with the past. Particularly in the area of perception, which lies at the heart of any nation, there is reason to look for continuity with the present. Discontinuity between present and past is possibly reflected more sharply in the changing political structures, rather than in mental processes which shape people's perception of nationhood. Thus the word nation can be applied to Rus' within agreed limits.

In exploring perceptions of nationhood it is important to remember that the writers who inform these perceptions reflect the views held by clerics and by those in power. A common feature of medieval literature, is the fact that the extant writings articulate what was considered to be important by an influential circle rather than by a cross-section of society.

The identity of a 'nation' was evidently perceived in different terms ten or so centuries ago. One of the biggest differences lay in the role

---

25 Hugh Seton-Watson also faced a similar problem in terminology when he investigated the formation of national identity and consciousness. Consequently he made a distinction between 'old nations', formed before articulated views on nationalism, and 'new nations' formed since that period. Such a distinction can be artificial and I would argue that his inclusion of Russia as one of the 'old nations' is misleading. According to his theory the formation of national identity and consciousness among the old nations was slow and obscure, a spontaneous process, which was not willed by any one person. When considering Rus', however, its formation is accelerated in comparison with countries like England. See Seton-Watson, Hugh, Nations and States, London, 1977.

26 Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, 2nd edn, London-New York, 1991, argues that all nations are imagined political communities distinguished by the style in which they are imagined. It may be added that the mutual perception of nationhood is seen to be more important than the occupation of a common territory or use of a common language. Anthony D. Smith, 'Nationalism and the Historians' in ed. Anthony D. Smith, Ethnicity and Nationalism, Leiden-New York-Cologne, 1992, p.73, agrees that there are continuities between the pre-modern community and the modern nation in areas such as myth, symbol and historical memory, suggesting that these may elucidate why the nation remains a focus of solidarity for many people.
accorded to religion. In the Middle Ages, countries tended to be identified by religion, an identity which was often linked inextricably to the political system of the day. For example, the head of the Byzantine Empire was the emperor, who was seen as God’s regent on earth. Thus the underlying model of authority was a universal one of the kingdom of God. By officially converting to Christianity, Rus’ became part of this wider perception of the universal kingdom.27

With the conversion and baptism of Rus’ seen as the means of entry to this new identity, an understanding of its nationhood was inextricably linked to Christian spirituality. What does one mean by ‘spirituality’? Like the ongoing discussions about national identity and nationhood, publications about spirituality have proliferated in recent years. In fact the term has only come into vogue this century and is even younger than the current understanding of nation. Its meaning has been extended from the narrowly Biblical understanding of ‘spiritual’, that which derives from the Holy Spirit, to an understanding which includes all religious faiths and also relates to the spirit of man.28 Potentially the term is therefore so broad, that, like the terms nation and nationhood, it benefits from being redefined at the beginning of a work. With regard to this study, ‘spirituality’ is relevant as the particularized human expression (in this case with reference to literary works) of what is perceived as transcendent within the Orthodox tradition. Thus the texts of prayers, viewed as communication with transcendent

---


28 Peter Toon, *What is Spirituality? And is it for me?*, London, 1989, p.15, quotes Jordan Aumann, *Spiritual Theology*, London, 1980, p.17, who comments ‘in its widest sense spirituality refers to any religious or ethical value that is concretized as an attitude or spirit from which one’s actions flow. This concept of spirituality is not restricted to any particular religion; it applies to any person who has a belief in the divine or transcendent and fashions a life-style according to one’s religious convictions’. He also notes Gordon Wakefield (ed.), *Dictionary of Spirituality*, London, 1983, p.361, who observes that spirituality has come ‘much into vogue to describe those attitudes, beliefs, practices which animate people’s lives and help them reach out towards supersensible realities’. According to these definitions spirituality is not necessarily perceived to be religious.
figures, by their very nature are expressive of spirituality. In addition, spirituality forms the second member of the pair together with nationhood. They form an appropriate partnership, given that in the Middle Ages nationhood and spirituality were generally seen as two parts of the same whole. The term ‘spirituality’ seems a suitable, if somewhat elusive term, for defining the interest of this study which centres on the texts of prayers.29

How did the bookmen and rulers of early Rus’ respond to the challenge of producing a written record which would chart their beginnings as a Christian nation? Clearly, at times it is impossible to be certain of the complexity of motivating factors at work which shaped events and affected the production of the texts in Rus’. I have, however, pinpointed three areas which would have affected the emerging perception of the nationhood of Rus’.

First, it is important to acknowledge the adoption of a Christian identity in the context of history. Even though the populations of the trading centres in Rus’ had been exposed to Christianity for at least a century, Vladimir I’s official acceptance of Christianity as a national religion and his marriage into the imperial Byzantine house, are a watershed. It seems likely that Vladimir was motivated in his choice of religion by a desire to establish firmer political and economic structures, as well as providing a cohesive religion which could unify Rus’ internally and put it on an equal footing with other countries which had adopted one of the religions of the Book. Identity was also realized in terms of culture, affecting social customs as well as the art and architecture of Rus’. Crucially, conversion helped to develop the systematic use of a written script in Rus’, considerably expanding the horizons for the trade of goods and ideas, as well as offering a tool to craft a record of its identity as a nation. Furthermore, Rus’ then became one of the Christian nations which possessed a language for

worship. Though different factors can cloud a historical perspective, for example the fact that literary records were often composed in retrospect, and events like Vladimir’s baptism and the conversion of Rus’ can be seen to have been simplified, one point emerges; Rus’ was not subsumed by its realignment to Orthodoxy but rather invigorated by it to form a clearer sense of nationhood.\(^{30}\)

Second, having accepted Christian identity, how could the Byzantine literary tradition help the bookmen of Rus’ to see their nation through a wider perspective of Christian history? One key factor was the perception transmitted explicitly through works such as John Malalas’ *Chronographia* and its *Continuatio*, and implicitly in most medieval writings, that Christian history operated within clearly delineated lines - Creation marked its beginning and Judgement its end, and events in-between were to be interpreted through a kind of sacred history. By sacred history what is meant is a record of past events which are often peopled by a mixture of historical figures and their Biblical prototypes. Christ is viewed as the focal point of history, so that events before his birth point to him and events after his life reflect the outworkings of providence. This typological method of interpretation characterizes many of the writings of the Early Church.\(^{31}\)

Naturally, the writers of early Rus’ also tended to view the unfolding of their own national story through such a filter. Thus Vladimir I is likened to Constantine the Great as a fellow apostle to his people. In general terms the christianization of the Roman Empire offered a model for the emergence of a Christian country. Here the combined work of the apostles, martyrs, and


saints, together with the miraculous conversion of Constantine the Great, could find its echo in the emergence of Rus'. In prayers native writers could illustrate the miraculous conversion of Vladimir I, apostle to Rus', as well as record the sentiments ascribed to its own martyrs and saints.  

Third, it is worth remembering that prayers were often, though not always, circumscribed by the need to reflect Christian dogma. Writing prayers might be also shaped by adherence to a traditional format, and by a focus on eternal considerations rather than concrete historical events. These factors could serve to 'disconnect' the prayer from the time of its composition, so that the prayers were perceived possibly more as models of spirituality rather records of human reaction and emotion. Rather than trying to establish whether the prayers under consideration may accurately reflect historical events, this study considers prayers as an expression of the writer's perceptions which he projects.

The perceptions of nationhood and spirituality are traced as they occur in a series of individual prayers which are arranged side by side according to a general thematic pattern, rather than forming a single national myth. This makes the overall shape of the study resemble a collection of stones placed side by side rather than a string of even pearls. Apart from the general thematic framework I have chosen, there is little to suggest an unbroken line of progress between the prayers of each chapter. On the contrary, the prayers can be seen to stand in isolation from each other, covering between them huge expanses of time (nearly four centuries).

---

32 In the first chapter of Michael Cherniavsky's, Tsar and People, New Haven, 1961, he sets out the way in which the writings on Vladimir I's conversion and the vitae of Boris and Gleb lay a basis for considering Rus' as a new terra sancta, sanctified by the blood of the princely martyrs.

33 Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard comment on the Kievo-centric view of Rus' which is promoted by the writers of the Primary Chronicle, and is still evident in the use of 'Kievan Rus' to describe some four hundred years of history. See The Emergence of Rus, xxix.

34 Connor Walker, 'The nation and its myth', in Anthony D. Smith (ed.), Ethnicity and Nationalism, (International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology LX, ed. K. Ishwaran), Leiden-New York-Cologne, 1992, pp.48-57, discusses how nations develop a myth of common descent and that for a sense of nationhood, people need a sense of separate origin and evolution. He then illustrates his thesis with examples from the speeches of Bismarck, Hitler and Mao, the francization of Napoleon's surname, and reports of the violence between ethnic groups such as the Georgians and Azeris.
and space (Bulgaria, Kiev and Turov are the three probable places of composition). Rather than seek to recreate a single all-encompassing concept of nationhood, this study investigates perceptions which emerged not in an even and modulated way, but rather as scattered traces left by successive generations of individual writers and scribes.

One principle of organization for this study is thematic. Accordingly, marks of the perception of Rus’ as a Christian nation are followed in the prayers. A written script is seen to be central to the emerging identity of Rus’, both in spreading Christianity and as a tool with which to express its sense of nationhood. The so-called Alphabetical prayer commonly attributed to Konstantin of Preslav, will be examined first. As a prayer it can be shown to express the way in which the word was perceived in the early days of the Slavonic script, reflecting an outlook that is closer in time and thought to the Cyrillo-Methodian mission. Second, I consider the prayers which depict the official conversion and baptism of Rus’ and its ruler, Vladimir I, seen here as marking a turning-point in the perception of nationhood. Third, the portrayal of the first native martyred princes, Boris and Gleb, is examined. Their identity, partly built up in the prayers attributed to them, is seen to affect the perception of Rus’ as a sanctified land, and the status of its rulers who are related to the martyred princes. In chapter four, the new identity of Rus’ as God’s people and country is examined in the light of the prayer which follows Ilarion’s Slovo o zakone i blagodati. In chapter five Rus’ is seen to be given a focus of spiritual excellence in its monastic intercessors, the founders and monks of the Kievan Caves Monastery, in particular St Feodosii. As well as contributing to the perception of Rus’ as a Christian nation, the monastery is seen through intercessory prayer to provide a beacon of heavenly reality in Rus’. Prince Vladimir Monomakh’s prayerful meditation at the beginning of his Pouchenie is considered in chapter six as providing a basis according to which the rulers of Rus’ should live as Christians. In chapter seven the
weekly prayer cycle by Kirill of Turov is analyzed as an expression of the interior, spiritual landscape which is seen to surpass boundaries of national identity.

A second organizing principle for this study is the rough chronological order of events. This order, however, does not always coincide with time of a prayer’s composition. Although Ilarion’s prayer was written before the extant accounts of Vladimir I and Boris and Gleb, it is treated in chapter four as a prayer to be said by the people of Rus’ following chapters two and three which examine the prayers attributed to princes.

The diversity of prayers under discussion is also reflected in the diversity of literary contexts in which they are found. Just as choosing prayers according to certain literary criteria would restrict a wider understanding of prayer, so selecting prayers according to context would limit the focus of this study. Because a prayer can be generally plucked out of one context and dropped into another with ease, there is potentially a variety of contexts for any given prayer. This is particularly true when a prayer is more self-contained thematically, and, when by virtue of its position, it can be more easily detached. For example, a prayer which serves as a prologue or an afterword can be plundered and inserted in another work without significant change. Where there is choice between different contexts, my aim is to focus on the context which appears to be of earlier origin, and also to integrate the study of its context with an exploration of the prayer’s significance within the work as a whole.

The literary contexts under scrutiny include Konstantin of Preslav’s translation of a Gospel commentary, to which the Alphabetical prayer forms a prologue. The Slovo o zakone i blagodati ascribed to Ilarion provides the setting for a prayer which follows directly after. Prayers attributed to Princes Vladimir I and his sons Boris and Gleb find their context in various narratives recounting their lives, and, in the case of Boris
and Gleb, their martyrdom. Nestor’s *Zhitie Feodosiia*, a number of
chronicle entries and the *Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik* provide the context for
material devoted to Feodosii and the Kievan Caves Monastery. Vladimir
Monomakh’s *Pouchenie* is the context for his opening prayerful meditation,
and Kirill of Turov’s prayers provide their own context in being arranged
according to the Church’s weekly cycle of daily observances.

Embracing such a variety of contexts, however, means that a flexible
approach is necessary in exploring the place of prayers. For example it is
natural that different questions will be raised by prayers set within
narratives, compared to prayers which are more loosely attached to a work
such as a sermon or commentary. As far as chapter five is concerned, the
interest lies in the literary context given to the perceived intercession by
those at the Kievan Caves Monastery, which includes specific texts of
prayers but does not focus exclusively on them. Kirill of Turov’s collection
of prayers also offers an unusual literary context, since in one respect they
form their own context.

Two prayers, the *Alphabetical prayer* and the prayer attributed to
Ilarion, require greater attention to textual problems since the shape of the
work affects the context. However, rather than isolate the textual study from
an interpretative discussion, both concerns have been integrated. The
contexts of both prayers can be seen to significantly affect the interpretation
of the prayers and their comment on the themes of nationhood and
spirituality.\(^{35}\) In the first chapter, the word, in its linguistic as well as its
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\(^{35}\) Two key figures in textual criticism are Karl Lachmann and Joseph Bédier. Lachmann is
known for his method of assigning manuscripts to genetic groups on the basis of shared errors,
groups which are then arranged into a tree structure of which the root is the lost archetype. See
the introductions to Karl Lachmann (ed.), *In T. Lucretii Cari De rerum natura libros
commentarius*, 1855, repr. New York, 1979 and *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*,
Berlin, 1842. Bédier on the other hand advocated the editing of a single ‘best’ manuscript rather than the
reconstruction of a hypothetical archetype. See Joseph Bédier, ‘De L’Édition princeps de “la
Chanson de Roland” aux éditions les plus récentes. premier article’, *Romantia*, 63, 1937, pp.433-
69; deuxième article, 64, 1938, pp.145-244; troisième article, 64, 1938, pp.487-521 and ‘La
Tradition manuscrit du Lai de L’Ombre: Réflexions sur l’art d’éditer les anciens textes, premier
distinguishes textology as an independent field of study in *Tekstologija*, Moscow-Leningrad,
1962. For a discussion of past and recent approaches to textual studies, in particular relating to
theological meaning as the Word, provides the keynote for an analysis of the *Alphabetical prayer*, as well as for a consideration of its position in the Gospel commentary (itself an elucidation of the Word). When considering Ilarion’s *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, I have chosen to look at the work through its creation of a unified identity for the people of Rus’, a concern which is also reflected in the prayer and serves to link the works together. Establishing such connections in retrospect is, of course, all too easy, and in both chapters, these more subjective considerations are supported by additional evidence.

Regarding Vladimir Monomakh’s *Pouchenie*, the prayerful meditation will be considered as providing a moral basis for the work, which in turn affects the question of its structure and past assumptions concerning its textual condition. Naturally it is important to underline that by synthesizing a textual and an interpretative approach I am not arguing that this is *the* method or a *better* method by which to study prayers in their literary context. Without due care such an approach has serious flaws. However, given the scope of this investigation, I would suggest that such an approach in this instance opens the way for a fruitful discussion.

When more than one account of a person’s life exists, for example the writings relating the lives of Vladimir I, Boris and Gleb, the question of context touches not only how prayers function within a particular narrative, but also how prayers compare with those used in other works. This means that elements which are indicative of nationhood and spirituality can be explored with attention to the complexity of differing perceptions rather than in terms of a general myth.

To summarize the limits of this study - although the prayers chosen are all native Slav writings as opposed to the vast number of translated

---


prayers, I have by no means included all the prayers of the period. No attempt has been made to examine a theology of prayer in the light of the Byzantine legacy and the writings of the early Slav Church. Similarly, the way in which the prayers relate to other liturgical works, to the veneration of icons and to the rules of prayer, is not under consideration here. Furthermore, I have not addressed in any detail the question of genre and the conventions of prayers, nor chosen to concentrate on tracing the textual development of individual works.

This study is distinctive in the way it takes into account two contemporary concerns - the perceptions of nationhood and spirituality - and relates them specifically to native Slav prayers and their literary contexts. The discussion of prayers in their literary context takes prayers from the sidelines of interpretative criticism, giving them a potentially central role in offering an interpretative key to the work as a whole. Overall, the contrast between the narrowness of any perspective gleaned from the relative dearth of material over four centuries, and the breadth of my theme, may make this study appear over ambitious. However, as I show, a close reading of prayers from different epochs is an effective way of gauging emerging perceptions of nationhood and spirituality.
The word of the *Alphabetical prayer*

Language and religion are two pivotal elements in any discussion of nationhood in a medieval context. Religion may be more powerful as a mark of nationhood if it is expressed in one's own language. For the people of Bulgaria and Rus', the Slavonic script was an asset in establishing their identity as a Christian nation and was, of course, a prerequisite for composing their own written prayers. With the Slavonic script as a foundation stone for these developments, it makes an appropriate starting point for this study.

Sts Cyril and Methodius created the Slavonic alphabet and translated the Scriptures and liturgy into Slavonic in the second half of the ninth century, above all, to make plain the Gospel word to the Slavs. Therefore the word understood as the word of the Slavonic script, and the word perceived as the *logos*, was of particular relevance to this mission. Before examining the concept of the word in the so-called *Alphabetical prayer* - an alphabetical acrostic commonly attributed to Konstantin of Preslav, who describes himself as one of Methodius’ disciples - I shall explore how the word is used in other writings originating from the early period of Slav mission. Then I shall examine the literary context of the prayer, suggesting that it fits well as a prologue to the commentary on the Gospels translated by Konstantin, a work which was also designed to make plain the Gospel word to the Slavs.

During the second half of the ninth century both Prince Rostislav of Moravia and Boris I of Bulgaria were keen to have proper translations of the Scriptures and liturgy in Slavonic. In both countries, initial missionary
work had already begun. In Moravia the Frankish missionaries used the Latin liturgy, while in Bulgaria, Byzantine missionaries used the liturgy in Greek. Clearly, the Slavonic liturgy was potentially of enormous benefit in both countries, particularly at a time when there was a developing sense of cultural and political awareness. It could help people to assimilate the Christian faith more easily, and also offered a greater measure of cultural and political autonomy. By the time of the official conversion of Rus’ in 988, the Slavonic script had already been in use for over a century. Undoubtedly the early passions aroused by the creation of a new alphabet for translating the liturgy had died down. In this respect the Slavonic script appears to have had an easier passage in Rus’ than in Moravia and Bulgaria.  

Before leaving Constantinople in 863, Cyril had already begun the task of making plain the Gospel word. In the Vita Constantini it records how Cyril translated the beginning of St John’s Gospel, which was the first reading for Easter: ‘ИСКОНИ ЕСЬ САМО И САМО ЕСЬ НУ БОГА, И БОГ ЕСЬ САМО, И ПРОВАЯ’. The medieval hagiographer was probably aware of the symbolic relevance of this passage. At the heart of the Christian dogma is seen to lie the word incarnate - the person of Christ, at once the source and summary of Christian faith. In the hagiographer’s eyes, Cyril’s translation of the sacred

1 See Dimitri Obolensky, The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500-1453, London, 1971. Obolensky notes that in the first half of the ninth century the Franks had translated a few key texts from Latin into Slavonic by transcribing them into Latin characters. Evidently Slavonic religious terms (if not whole texts) were transcribed by means of the Greek alphabet for those Slavs living inside the Byzantine Empire (p.138).
2 Francis Thomson, ‘SS. Cyril and Methodius and a mythical Western heresy: trilinguisum’, (A contribution to the study of patristic and mediaeval theories of sacred languages), Analecta Bollandiana, 110, 1992, pp.67-122, demonstrates that there is no evidence to show that trilinguisum was a heresy in the true sense of the word. However, he points out that there would have been opposition from the Latin and Greek camps to using a newly created alphabet for translating the liturgy. I. Tarannidis, ‘Latin opposition to the missionary work of Cyril and Methodius’, The Legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius to Kiev and Moscow, ed. A.E. Tachiaos, Thessaloniki, 1992, pp.49-62, argues that the over-riding Frankish objection to the brothers’ mission concerned theological differences rather than a rejection of the use of the Slavonic liturgy.
3 Lavrov, Materialy, p.27
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books is a fulfillment of prophecy: 'и штерозошка по пророческому словеси, аминь
gлавыхъ фульшати книжняъ словеси, и назваъ нань бысть глаголовъ'.

The Prolog, generally thought to have been composed by Cyril as the prologue to his translation of the Gospels, resonates with the motifs of the word and the Slavonic script. Isaiah’s prophecy, ‘славии предстъ, глаголи
оцышште слово Божие’; is also quoted by Cyril, and it becomes a rallying cry in support of the Slavonic script. The adjective ‘сладокъ ный’ reinforces the need for the word to be transmitted by means of a script. For Cyril, spiritual tragedy is seen as ignorance of the word, as a soul without letters (душа безъ глагола). Spiritual growth is depicted in the Prolog as a shower of letters (требующие дожда божии глагол). So that the Slavs will be spiritually alive, Cyril urges them to pay attention to the written word as it is conveyed by the Gospel writers, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John:

Въ симвелия нынѣ всѣ глаголы, слышите Слове въ народѣ вѣка, слышите
cavo вт Бога бо приде, слово же крѣпить душѣ человѣческой, слово же
крѣпить срѣдѣ и рѣмы, слово въ са сотвори Бога познаны.

In the Gospels the word is described as coming from God, with St John emphasizing the nature of the incarnate Word. Cyril structures this section so that the emphasis falls on the word. After telling the Slavs three times to listen, he announces what they must listen to - the word which has come from God. Then ‘сазо’ is repeated three times, creating a cluster of words beginning with ‘с’. Two assonant verbs, ‘крѣпить’ and ‘крѣпить’, also describe the effect of the word, both verbs which indicates the word’s role in sustaining life. The word is also perceived as the key to understanding God’s law, which as Cyril explains, makes known paradise. The soul bereft
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4 Lavrov, Materialy, p.28
5 Lavrov, Materialy, p.196
6 The Prolog deplores words spoken in an alien tongue which cannot be understood, ‘да не ймъ
иногоя слова н. грлагола’ изъ слово слышаніи слове’ (Lavrov, Materialy, p.197).
7 Lavrov, Materialy, p.197.
8 Lavrov, Materialy, p.196.
of letters and unable to see God's law is compared to an eye that is sightless without light. Without the knowledge of God, Cyril compares man to stone, and without books, he describes nations as naked and vulnerable to attack. Thus the need for people to hear and understand the Gospels in Slavonic it is seen as a matter of life and death, both on an individual and national level.

Despite initial support from Rome for the Slavonic liturgy, after Methodius' death on 6th April 869, Pope Stephen V prohibited the Slavonic liturgy and recommended that only preaching should be carried out in the vernacular. Meanwhile Wiching, the Bishop of Nitra and a trenchant opponent of the Slavonic liturgy, led a persecution which expelled Methodius' remaining disciples from Moravia.

The Christian prince Boris of Bulgaria welcomed the fugitives, pleased to find men trained in the Slavonic script who could help to christianize his country and give religion a national rather than a Byzantine face. One aspect of this mission was to translate commentaries which would help make plain the Gospel word. Konstantin of Preslav, working in Bulgaria from the late ninth to the early tenth century, translated a Gospel commentary which consists of fifty-one Sunday sermons. The *Alphabetical prayer* forms the prologue to this commentary in one thirteenth-century Synodal manuscript.\(^\text{10}\)

\(^9\) Τὰς ἰδιότητας Κυρίλλου, ἐν σκιάς ἐπάθη μέν ἐν θάλασσαι, ἐν θάλασσαι καθότι ἐπάθη μέν ἐν θάλασσαι, ἐν θάλασσαι ἐν θάλασσαι ἐν θάλασσαι (Λαύτο, Materialy, p.196).

\(^{10}\) Before the 'rediscovery' of Konstantin in the middle of the last century, it was assumed that Cyril was the author of the *Alphabetical prayer*. Subsequently, the weight of scholarly opinion has fallen in favour of Konstantin, though Cyril’s authorship was still being contended in the first half of this century by Georgiev and Franko. See I. Franko, ‘Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte der kirchenslavischen Literatur’, *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, 3, 1914, pp.150-79 and Emil Georgiev, *Dve proizvedenia na sv. Kirila*, (Studia Historico-Philologica Serdicensia Supplementi 2), Sofia, 1938; hereafter Georgiev, *Dve proizvedenia*. Konstantin’s identity relies primarily on two references. The heading of the forty-second sermon in the Gospel commentary indicates that at least one was composed by Konstantin the Presbyter, whom it names as its author, ‘ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΘΕΤΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΜΙΧ ΝΕΜΙΤΗ ΜΗ ΑΡΙΟΥ’. See Archbishop Antonii, *Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi*, 2nd edn, St Petersburg, 1895, (hereafter Antonii, *Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi*), p.224. In the prose preface which follows the prayer in the Synodal manuscript, the author describes himself as ‘ΑΡΙΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ’. Konstantin is also mentioned in a second source. A postscript, attached to a translation of four sermons against the heretic Arius by Athanasius of
In the past discussion about the *Alphabetical prayer* has tended to focus on the interpretation of several lines of the prayer and how this may, or may not, affect the question of authorship. In addition, its form as an alaphetical acrostic and as syllabic verse has attracted attention. With the discovery of an increasing number of manuscripts, the questions of different redactions has been raised. Rather than add new arguments to these areas of study, my intention is to examine the *Alphabetical prayer* and its literary setting in the Synodal manuscript, that is as a prologue to Konstanin’s translated Gospel commentary, through the perspective given by the word.

The question of the word and its relation to the prayer has been touched on by Georgiev and Kuev. On the one hand, Georgiev describes the

Alexandria, describes Konstantin as a bishop and a disciple of Methodius. It further informs the reader that Konstantin undertook this work of translation under the order of the Bulgarian Prince Simeon. See A. Gorski, & K. Nevostreuev, *Opisanie slavianskikh rukopisei Moskovskoi Sinodal’noi biblioteki*, II, 1859, Moscow, (hereafter Gorski & Nevostreuev, II, *Opisanie*), pp.32-3. Šafarik notes that in the postscript to Konstantin’s translation of the four sermons against Arius, he locates himself in the vicinity of the river which runs by the ancient capital of Preslav, and therefore surmises that he was Bishop of Preslav. See P.I. Šafarik (Šafarik), ‘Rastsvet slavianskoi pis’mennosti v Bulgarii’, tr. O. Bodianskii,* Chienia v Imp. obshchestei istorii i drevnosti teo rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom Universitete*, zasedanie 28-go fevralia 1848 goda, 7, 1848, pp.49-59.

For a summary of the debate over whether Cyril or Konstantin wrote the Alphabetical prayer see E.G. Zykov, ‘K voprosu ob avtore “Azbuchnoi molitvy”’, *Izvestiia na Instituta za bulgarska literatura*, 9, 1960, pp.173-97.

For over a century critics have concentrated on the reconstruction of the original text, negotiating two thorny problems. First, the text has been altered by linguistic development and the process of copying, and second, it is difficult to judge how stringently the writer adhered to a metrical pattern. Sobolevskii placed the prayer in the Byzantine tradition, describing it as somewhat similar to ‘political verse’ since the caesura generally comes after the fifth syllable, and the accent nearly always falls on the penultimate syllable of the line.. See A.I. Sobolevskii, ‘Tserkovno-slavianskii istoki: stikhotvoreniia IX-X vekov i ikh znachenie dlia izuchenia tserkovno-slavianskogo izyka’, *Trudy odinnadtsatogo arkheologicheskogo s’ezda v Kieve 1899*, ed. G. Uvarova & S. Shutskii, II, Moscow, 1902, p.37.

Zykov marks out four groups of manuscripts which he divides into two redactions. His first redaction comprises the thirteenth-century Synodal manuscript, together with the third and the fourth groups, while the second redaction consists only of his second group. Zykov accounts for the difference between the redactions by suggesting that the prayer was remodelled from its original Glagolitic orientation to the Cyrillic. He characterizes the Synodal manuscript as the earliest and in many respects the closest to the original. For a description of the four groups and the manuscripts see E.G. Zykov, ‘Sud’ba “Azbuchnoi molitvy” v drevnerusskoi pis’mennosti’, *TODL*, 26, 1971, (hereafter Zykov, ‘Sud’ba’), pp.183-6. Although Kuev expands the number of manuscripts under consideration to thirty-eight, he does not radically revise Zykov’s theory of two redactions. To a greater degree than Zykov, Kuev accepts the Synodal manuscript as providing the earliest and most reliable text of the *Alphabetical prayer*. See Kuio Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva v slavianskite literaturi*, Sophia, 1974; hereafter Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva*.
main theme of the Proglas and the Alphabetical prayer as the ‘cult of the word’ in support of his view that Kirill wrote both works. On the other hand, Kuev rejects Georgiev’s notion that ‘slovo’ may refer to the logos in the context of the Alphabetical prayer. Like other writers, Kuev, interprets the author’s cry for the ‘προς τὸν Λόγον’ as a plea for artistic inspiration. Although Georgiev’s reference to the ‘cult of the word’ highlights an important theological and cultural axis of the early Slavonic literary world, it does injustice to the complexity of ways in which the writers employ the term ‘word’. Therefore it seem appropriate to first explore what the writers of that epoch may have understand by slovo and its significance for the emerging Slavonic Church. Then I will return to a consideration of the ‘word’ in the Alphabetical prayer, and the implications it has for an understanding of the prayer as a prologue to Konstantin’s Gospel commentary.

The word is seen to be central to an understanding of Christian theology. In St John’s Gospel Christ is described as the logos, pre-existent, and one with the Father. Here John exploits the logos by incorporating the Greek ideas about the originating principle at the heart of the universe, and also the Old Testament idea of the word crowning key moments of faith.
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14 Using this argument to support his opinion that Cyril is the author of both works, Georgiev in addition parallels Cyril’s prayer for the Slav people before he dies, ‘νῦν ἐλάλησεν ὁ στόχαστος τῶν Ορθόνομων’, with the author’s cry in the Alphabetical prayer, ‘δὲ ἐλάλησεν ὁ στόχαστος τῶν Ορθόνομων’. He also cites other references to the cult of the word from Vita Constantini and Vita Clementis. See Georgiev, Dve proizvedeniai, pp.41-7.

15 See Kuev, Azbuchnata molitva, pp.114-7

16 See J. Packer, (ed.), New Dictionary of Theology, Leicester, 1988, (hereafter Packer, New Dictionary), pp.395-6. O. Brooks, ‘Nicene Orthodoxy and fourth century mysticism’, Actes du XIIe Congrès International d’Études Byzantines. Ochrida. 10-16 Sept. 1961, 2, Belgrade, 1964, pp.475-84, outlines how Clement of Alexandria reinterprets Philo’s exegesis so that the logos, the Son, is the wisdom and power by which the unknowable God is made known. In the Scriptures the word is important for example, in the book of Genesis where God’s words are seen to create the universe and people are created with the ability to think and speak. Old Testament prophecies are sometimes introduced as ‘the word of the Lord’ and foretell the coming Messiah and the inclusion of the Gentiles as God’s people. In the New Testament, the word is made comprehensible to people at Pentecost, reversing the judgement of Babel. In general, in the Old Testament, and more clearly in the New, particularly in John’s Gospel, the person and word of God are seen as inseparable.
Writings attributed to Ioan Ekzarkh reveal a familiarity with the concept of the *logos*. In the opening of his work *Pokhvala sv. Ioana Bogoslovtsa* Ioan uses the analogy of a spoken word to describe the relationship between Son and Father. He compares the utterance of a word - whereby what is initially concealed in a person and part of their spiritual essence is made known to others - to the incarnation of the Son, who shares the essence of the Father and is revealed to all. Quoting from the first verse of John’s Gospel Ioann elaborates why two different tenses are used in Greek, and subsequently in the Slavonic translation, to distinguish between the human and divine:

“Ей начало бе слова, и слово бе с Бога и Богъ бе слова.” Со бе ей начало с Бога “где слове бысть в ем и без него не бысть ничтоже.” Егда речеть “бысть”, то къ твари исходять... Єгда ам исходимъ къ Богъ “єгъ” непоядясь, Єгда исходимъ къ твари, “бысть” приемет. Єгда исходимъ къ господу бысть утворит’ ти приеметъ, “єгъ”. 

The imperfect of the verb ‘to be’ is seen to convey the eternal nature of the *logos*, while the aorist is employed to depict the human and finite world into which the *logos* entered, corresponding to the imperfect “*ην*”, (translated by the Slavonic ‘єгъ’), and the aorist “*євенто*” (which is translated by ‘єсть’). This subtlety of translation appears to have been lost in later Slavonic translations in which the verse reads ‘*Богъ еваще слова*’.

Ioan’s comments on the beginning of John’s Gospel can be seen to shed light on a variant found in a South Slav manuscript of the *Vita* 
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18 Ivanova-Mircheva, *Ioan Ekzarkh*, p.168
19 Ivanova-Mircheva, *Ioan Ekzarkh*, pp.124-5, compares passages from the *Shestodnev* with the *Pokhvala Ioana Bogoslovtsa* and interprets the close parallel as additional evidence for Ioan’s authorship of both works.
*Constantini* of Cyril’s prayer which he reportedly uttered as he faced death. In his prayer he comments that from now on he is servant neither to the emperor, nor to any other earthly master, but only to the sovereign God, concluding with the words ‘*Не е* Х и *бых*, и *если в* е*квы* аминь’.

In the light of Ioan’s explanation of the first verse of John’s Gospel, this last phrase can be interpreted in the following way. Though Cyril did not exist from infinity (*Не е* Х), unlike Christ of whom it could be said ‘*е* начало в*е* слово’, but rather existed only in a human and finite world (*бых*), at the end of his life Cyril sees his life as partaking of the eternal present of the heavenly kingdom (*если в* е*квы*). If instead Cyril’s prayer simply reads ‘*и е* Х и *если в* е*квы*, аминь’, according to the principles which govern the above interpretation, he is implicitly claiming for himself the nature of the pre-existent *logos* of whom John wrote ‘*е* начало в*е* слово’. By contrast the threefold progression of ‘*Не е* Х, и *бых*, и *если в* е*квы* аминь’ encapsulates Cyril’s theosis within a sacred number.

Both Ioan Ezarkh’s *Pokhvala sv. Ioana Bogoslavtsa* and the variant of Cyril’s final prayer indicate the level on which two writers understood the *logos*.

The *logos* was also used to defend the doctrine of the Trinity, crucial to the orthodoxy of the Slavonic Church. Both Cyril and Methodius are depicted as facing questions about Trinity from the Jews and Mohammedans of their day. In the *Vita Constantini*, when the Khazar Kagan proposes a toast in the name of the one God Creator, Cyril is seen to reply shrewdly with an answer pointing to the three persons of the Trinity active in creation: ‘*е* (има) единого Бога и совести его, иже небеса сотвориласка, и животворящаго духа, иже еса сила ихъ состоята’. He further illustrates the doctrine of the Trinity by then asking the Kagan whether he thinks himself
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21 Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.65
22 Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.34
24 Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.14
truly honoured by the person who respects him but not his word or spirit, or
by the one who honours all three. All three, is the answer given by the
Kagan, inadvertently illustrating the relationship between the Father, the
Spirit and the Word. In the *Vita Methodii* there are likewise a number of
references which explain the doctrine of the Trinity in terms of the *logos.*

Using the same idea as contained in Cyril’s reply to the Kagan, the writer
affirms: ‘σαμανν μασοσδαα μεσα αυτοκτονια, και σαμανν μασό του επικο
ικία, όταν τα ρεχ, και θάλα, τα ποιητικ, και σαμαννιας’.

*Here verse nine is added on, ‘For he spoke, and it came to be; he commanded and it stood forth’,
underlining the unity between the divine word and action. The *exordium* of
the *Vita Methodii* sets out the basic tenets of the Orthodox faith, including
an understanding of the Trinity. He quotes how Christ, as the *logos* speaks
and affirms his oneness with the Father: ‘και σε ευαγγελια ρεα και κονσα σεκε
πρεκτικριαν ρεα, καππαγκια κα ποσικτικα λετα ησυχο γακυρ σπακελινα: και εκ
οτινι και οτινι κα μνη.’

In both *vitae* the doctrine of the Trinity receives
attention and the brothers are seen to show a deep personal devotion to the
Trinity. Cyrill is reported to have told the Emperor that he is willing to live
or die for the Trinity.

The *vitae* of Sts Cyril, Methodius and Kliment of Ochrid all
emphasize the importance of the word, though not always in the sense of
*logos.* As missionaries, translators and teachers, words were naturally seen
to be crucial to their work. Besides which, none of these saints were
renowned for spectacular miracles of healing and therefore miracles were
sought in their words, in particular prophecies. This section will consider
briefly the portrayal of words in the *Vita Constantini*, the *Vita Methodii* and
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25 Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.68
26 Lavrov, *Materialy*, pp.67-8
27 Cyril declares to the emperor: ‘μαν και τη και αν συμπροσικη, και θεσ και ησυχασενα κα οικα εκει,
οτα σε στιγκ τριετο καιρατι και χρημα καιτα?’ (Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.8). Likewise Methodius before
the *Vita Clementis* before applying what has been discovered to the *Alphabetical prayer*.

The *Vita Constantini* portrays Cyril as an intellectual, a gifted translator and a persuasive speaker whose words could convert men’s souls and even avert violence. As a linguist Cyril has a distinguished career. En route to a debate with the Khazars, the author narrates how Cyril stops off and learns the Hebrew language, converting two people in the process, and then learning what is arguably either Slavonic or Syriac. For his next major mission he begins to translate the sacred books into Slavonic. Much of the *Vita Constantini* recounts the content of Cyril’s debates. The author identifies his source as eight discourses translated by Archbishop Methodius, which he explains, he has abbreviated. If the reader could draw from the original work, then the author assures him that he would feel the full force of Cyril’s words. In another phrase containing a triple alliteration, the Kagan is reported to be impressed with the sweetness of Cyril’s words. Opposing the so-called trilingual heresy, Cyril’s weapons are described as words. In Cyril’s final prayer he is depicted as petitioning God to destroy the trilingual heresy and to inspire his Slav flock with the teaching of God’s word. Cyril’s edifying words (ἀκαδοκιά στολος του του Θεου λόγου) are seen to convert a hostile Khazar chief, and shortly afterwards his words deliver the saint and his party from a vicious attack by the Magyars. Words are seen to be at the heart of Cyril’s activity as debater, translator and missionary.

28 Marvin Kantor, *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*, (Michigan Slavic Translations V), Michigan, 1983, pp.86-8, n.33, summarizes the main arguments surrounding this question and gives bibliographical references. Much of the discussion centres on whether one accepts that the roots *sur’rus’* were inverted by the scribe so that *rus’skimi* originally read *sur’skimi*.

29 Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.28

30 Lavrov, *Materialy*, p.35
The author of the *Vita Methodii* also attaches great importance to words. He portrays the saint as one who marries word and deed, who speaks words that are gentle and strong.\(^1\) Methodius’ orthodoxy as a teacher is underscored. Prince Rostislav’s letter to Michael III requests a teacher who will instruct them in what is right and true, clarifying the teaching already given by the Latins, Greeks and Germans. In the *Vita Constantini* Rostislav emphasizes the need for someone who will teach them in their own language. Thus in the *Vita Methodii* correct teaching is highlighted rather than the use of the Slavonic language. In addition, a record is included setting out the content of two separate papal letters which show unreserved approval for Methodius’ teaching. Evidently the need to defend the orthodoxy of the brothers’ teaching was at the fore by the time the *vita* was written. As well as being an able and orthodox teacher, Cyril, like his brother, is portrayed as a miracle-worker through his prophetic words.

The author of the *Vita Clementis*, commonly held to be Theophylact of Ochrid, often uses the concept of the word in the sense of *logos*. When recounting how Pope Hadrian consecrated the Slavonic liturgy, Theophylact draws attention to the joy of the Word in the word by clustering words with the same root as ‘logos’: ‘τί γὰρ τὸ λόγω λόγου τοὺς λογικοὺς ἀλογίας λυτροῦμένου τερπνότερον’.\(^2\) Theophylact’s delight in wordplay also emerges in his depiction of Cyril’s death. He describes it in terms of the supreme Philosopher receiving the philosopher, the great Teacher taking to himself the voice of the Word.\(^3\) As for Clement, Theophylact depicts him as a zealous and tireless instructor of the word who taught literacy and trained numerous clergy.

\(^1\) ‘σαμε ωθείκεν οἱ κραταν, ωθείκεν αν πρακτικώσι, α κραταν οι πρακτικώσια καλαννι.’ (*Laumov, Materialy*, p.70).


\(^3\) ‘Καὶ δέσποτε τὸν Φιλόσοφον ὁ Φιλόσοφος, ὁ μέγας διδάσκαλος τὴν τοῦ λόγου φωνὴν προσλαμβάνεται’ (Bilbasov, *Kirill i Mefodii*, p.279). Theophylact’s penchant for rhetoric and his relish for the multifaceted concept of the *logos* undoubtedly reflect his Greek education. Dimitri Obolensky outlines Clement’s career beginning with his education in a private school in Constantinople where Psellus was one of his teachers (*Six Byzantine Portraits*, Oxford, 1988, pp.36-67).
Thus the vitae of Cyril, Methodius and Clement are seen to focus on the word, each in the way most appropriate to the events which the authors depict. There are clear instances when the 'word' is seen to refer to the Johannine concept of the *logos*. In explaining the basic tenets of Christian faith the *logos* is also viewed as the third person of the Trinity. In general the word is perceived to carry great weight, especially at a time when the success of Christian mission depended to a large extent on talented linguists, debators and teachers. Thus a cursory investigation of the perception of the word and its connection to the *logos* provides a useful backdrop for discussing the *Alphabetical prayer*. Overall, it suggests that while there is evidence of an appreciation of *slovo* in the Johannine sense of *logos*, there are also many instances of *slovo* used in a more general way.

The Synodal manuscript will be used as a basis for examining the *Alphabetical prayer*, since it originates from the thirteenth century and is therefore several centuries earlier than variant manuscripts which derive predominantly from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with a handful from the fifteenth century.\(^\text{34}\)

The word *slovo* occurs in the *Alphabetical prayer* with greater frequency than any other single word, save for possessive adjectives and conjunctions. It occurs at five key points and on each occasion is redefined by its context. Before drawing any conclusions about what Konstantin may

---

\(^{34}\) For ease of reference, I am using the numbering Kuev gives to the list of manuscripts of the *Alphabetical prayer* which he reproduces. For details see Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva*, pp.185-304. Regrettably Kuev’s book contains a number of mistakes and the copies of manuscripts should be rechecked against the original. I have been unable to do this except in the examples given of reproductions from original manuscripts. Nos. 26 & 27 have been excluded from this study because no. 26 has significantly expanded the lines, while no. 27 shows a change in the direction of the prayer by introducing the theme of sin, ‘Αλλά γάρ τον θανάτον μεν, γλυκά γάρ και στόμα στὸ στρεφώνται’ (p.271). I have also used three additional published texts of the *Alphabetical prayer*, numbered for convenience rather than according to chronology as:

39. Uchitel'noe evanigelie, 15th-16th centuries, f.98 no.1838, RGB
40. Sbornik, 15th century, Kir. bel. 22/1099, RNB
41. Tolkovaia psaltyr’, 18th century, coll. P.I. Shchukin no.5, GIM

Nos. 39 & 40. are published in K. Kuev’s article, ‘Novootkriti prepisi na Azbuchnata molitva’, *Palaeobulgarica*, 3, 1979, 4, pp.26-33, and no. 41 is found in Kh. Trendafilov’s article, ‘Neizvestnyi spisok Azbuchnoi molitvy’, *Palaeobulgarica*, 10, 1986, 1, pp.77-80
have meant by using the word *slovo*, it is worth examining each instance in context.

The first line of the prayer begins:

\[\text{Азъ славимъ, гимнъ молямъ са Богу.}\]

Evidently the petitioner is aware of the Slavonic word with which he addresses God. By inverting 'this word' (\textit{славимъ, гимнъ}), 'I' is juxtaposed with 'word', \textit{'Азъ славимъ'}, reinforcing two essential elements of this prayer, the petitioner and the word of the Slavonic language.\(^{35}\)

The writer, however, requires more than the human word to accomplish his purpose. He asks for the Holy Spirit to inspire the word in his heart so that it will guide those living in the path of God’s commands:

\[\text{Господа Даждхь посланъ женьшулаго.} \]
\[\text{Да еднахнеть въ срдцу мнъ слово.} \]
\[\text{Неже еднахть на жстехъ всемъ.} \]
\[\text{Женьшулага, въ заповѣдахъ тн.} \]

An alternative reading of the second line juxtaposes 'срдцце' and 'слово' - 'Да еднахнеть мнъ въ срдце слово'. In this reading the petitioner, now responding with his heart, is once again juxtaposed with the word, now perceived as inspired by the Spirit.\(^{36}\) This petition has been generally understood against the background of the writer's cry to the Muse for inspiration, a topos which marks the beginning of many classical works of antiquity.\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{35}\) By contrast other variants invert the word order and read: \textit{'Азъ слово славимъ'} (nos. 2, 3, 5, 7, 21, 24 & 38).

\(^{36}\) Twenty-three of the thirty-nine manuscripts (nos. 26 & 27 are not used in my study) contain this reading (nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 15, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 41). No. 22 adds an extra word, 'Да еднахнеть мнъ въ срдци слово Евангъ'. Other variants include 'my' referring either to 'heart' or 'word', for example, \textit{'въ сердце мнъ слове'} nos. 4, 8, 12, 15, 19, 30, 35, 36, 37, 39; no. 40, which contains a mixed reading 'Да еднахнеть мнъ сердце мнъ слове', and nos. 10 & 11 where the prepositional case is used, \textit{'въ сердце мнъ слове'}. Significantly, the manuscripts of Zykov’s second redaction, which correspond to nos. 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 15, 30, 35, 36, 37 (as well as those published since Zykov’s article which contain features characteristic of his second redaction, nos. 19, 39 and 40), are all distinguished by the use of the accusative or prepositional case for the personal pronoun rather than the dative case. This can be cited as an additional feature of the manuscripts Zykov listed as belonging to the second redaction.

\(^{37}\) Kuev, \textit{Азбуchnata molitva}, p.124
Konstantin’s more specific entreaty to God that the Spirit inspire his heart with the word can be seen as an acknowledgement of the Trinity as Father, Spirit and logos. As the prayer progresses, Konstantin’s appeals to the Trinity become more marked. The Spirit’s role in giving life and inspiration is hinted at by Konstantin’s use of the epithet ‘living’.

The recipients of the inspired word are evidently those who have already responded to the God’s commands, like the listeners of Konstantin’s translations of Gospel sermons. This points to a later stage of Slavonic Christianity than is suggested by Cyril’s Prolog, which is a plea for the Slavs to listen to the word and find salvation. Earlier scholars argued that the present tense of the verb ‘to fly’ in ‘АЕНТБ ТО ИИМБ Е Н СЛАВЕМСКО ПЛАМΑ. / ΚΔ ΚΡΙΜЕИΝΙ οΡΑΤΗΝΗ ΣΑ ΒΛΗ’ must mean that the conversion and baptism of the Bulgarians was happening at the time of composition. This assumption makes Cyril rather than Konstantin the likely author. Less successful attempts have been made to apply this reference to the conversion of other Slavonic peoples. Kuev re-evaluates past interpretations, arguing that each line should be read separately. As a precedent for such a reading, he points to a number of Byzantine acrostics and also to the punctuation of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript, in which each line of the prayer ends with a constellation of dots. Accordingly, if ‘ΚΔ ΚΡΙΜΙΝΙ οΡΑΤΗΝΗ ΣΑ ΒΛΗ’ is read as an independent semantic unit, this would suggest that in Konstantin’s day baptism was already a fait accompli among the Bulgarians. Here, he maintains, they are only seeking to solidify their Christian faith and their identity as God’s people. Without drawing firm conclusions regarding the above arguments, I would note that this line is open to interpretation partly because the writer does not specify a particular territory but a people identified primarily by language. The Slavonic race (СЛАВЕМСКО ПЛАМΑ) refers

38 Gorskii and Nevostruev assumed that the writer was referring to the conversion of the Bulgarians as a contemporary event, an assumption which received wide acceptance among scholars (Gorskii & Nevostruev, Opisanie, II, p.410).
39 Tunitskii proposes that this refers to the conversion of the Peleponnese Slavs. See N. Tunitskii, Sv. Kliment, episkop slovenskii. Ego zhizn’ i prosvetitel’naia deiatel’nost, Sergiev Posad, 1913.
to those to whom the Slavonic word is addressed, conceivably those living in Moravia, Salonika and other parts of the Slav world.

Having considered the human and Slavonic word of prayer, and the Spirit’s inspired word, Konstantin now turns to the word of Scripture:

ZELO EK NSTY. SVETNAMYK JIZNIN.
ZAKON TEOY. I SVET SYZAMY.
NIJE NICTET. SVETELSA SLOKA.
H PROSIT DARY TEOY PRINATI.

The image of God’s word being a light for one’s path is a favourite reminiscence from the Old Testament. The reference to the light of life also recalls Jesus’ claim about himself in the New Testament. A merging of these two allusions combines the Old Testament idea of the Scriptures with the New Testament fulfilment of the living word incarnate in Christ. In the first line, nine of the thirty-eight manuscripts use the second person singular of the verb ‘to be’ so that it reads: ‘STEO EK ECH SVETNAMYK JIZNIN’. This strengthens the identity of the ‘Gospel word’ as the logos, the person of Christ who came as the light of the world. Even though this varaint may not represent the original reading, it apparently did not seem out of place to the scribes. A more persuasive and regular feature of the prayer is Konstantin’s consistent use of ‘slovo’ in the singular. Used in the singular the ‘Gospel word’ could here signify the text of the Gospels, as well as alluding to the logos. If instead ‘slovo’ is used in the plural, then the possible allusion to the logos is lost in this instance. The line, ‘H PROSIT DARY TEOY PRINATI’, follows the reference to those seeking the Gospel word. The association of the Gospel word with God’s gift is also one made in Cyril’s remark in the

40 ‘Thy word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path’ (Ps 119:105). ‘Again Jesus spoke to them, saying, “I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life”’ (John 8:12).
41 Nos. 2, 3, 7, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 28 contain ‘ew’.
42 Six of the thirty-eight manuscripts refer to words in the plural, ‘NIJE NICTET SVETELSA SLOKA’, departing from the otherwise consistent use of the singular ‘slovo’ (see nos. 9, 8, 10, 12, 21, 37).
Prolog, 'съ же нысь даръ: Мат'еи, Мар'ко, Лука, Иоанъ'. At the climax of the writer's petition for help, the 'Gospel word' is again mentioned, 'и посмотрите в слово евангельское', after which his petition gives way to praise. The double reference to the Gospel word at key points in the prayer suggests that making plain the Gospel word lies at the heart of his petition.

For Zykov, one of the distinctive features of his second redaction is the loss of two lines, 'законъ твои, и святъ стыламь' and 'и проси дары тема приврат', and also the alteration of another line, 'и бо нысть святъствникъ жизни', so that it reads:

Зело бо соть еваньши к жизни
И Иже ищеть евангьска слова.
И И есь ти бо нына, словьско племя.

Zykov postulates that in the second redaction the lines are changed from a Glagolitic to Cyrillic ordering. While one may choose to disagree about Zykov's ordering of the letters of the two alphabets, his hypothesis works on a semantic level, as both redactions of the prayer read well. The phrase 'еваньши к жизни' in the second redaction echoes Konstantin's earlier request that he should be inspired with the word that brings success to all living according to God's laws. Regardless of which redaction is considered closer to the original, both highlight the importance of God's law and words, especially the Gospel word. This focus would be appropriate for a writer preparing to translate a commentary of the Gospels.

Having established that his audience are those who live according to God's commands and who seek the Gospel word, Konstantin asks for the 'expansive word':

На миле ныне простило слово дажды.

Giambelluca-Kossova interprets the meaning of 'prostrano' in the light of one of the lines which follows in the second redaction, 'предаются пищей':

---

43 Lavrov, Materialy, p.196
44 Zykov, 'Sud'ba', p.190
She proposes that ‘pishcha’ is probably the original reading, echoing a Pauline reference that regards Gospel words as nourishment. In this context she understands ‘prostrano’ to signify ‘true’ and ‘sincere’. This connection, however, is somewhat tenuous and contradicts her approach earlier in the same article which is to question the authenticity of lines reflecting Biblical texts. For example, in the instance of ‘Законъ твоїй и світъ стьязамь’, she suggests that its allusion to a well-known Biblical text probably indicates its later origin. The expression ‘пострано слово’ is, however, known from other works attributed to Konstantin. In Konstantin’s prayer to the Trinity at the beginning of the third sermon of the Gospel commentary, he prays for the expansive word, ‘мне же слово подасть пространо и разумно, хитро же и мудро, въ наслаждение слушателей, творитъ заповѣдань яко светильникъ ногами монма, законъ твой и свѣть стьязыма монми’. Here he qualifies the word by the adjectives ‘intelligible’, ‘clever’ and ‘wise’, and he goes on to echo the psalmist’s cry that God’s commands be a lamp to his feet and his law a light to his paths. Furthermore, in a eulogistic canon to Methodius, the author, generally held to be Konstantin, also asks God for the expansive word, ‘дайте, Христе Спасе, едине милосердие, слово пространно, мудрость, твори милости да светъ ти есчѣала Мардами и та проклала’. These factors suggest that the line ‘Законъ твоїй и світъ стьязамь’ could easily have been written by Konstantin, while giving no firm grounds for this assumption. In the examples cited, Konstantin’s cry for the ‘expansive word’ connotes the word which is intelligible and expansive, both in a literal and a metaphorical sense, a fitting request from one seeking to disseminate the teaching of the Sunday Gospel readings.

45 A. Dzhambeluka-Kossova (Giambelluca-Kossova), ‘Vuzstanovim li e tekstut na Azbuchnata molitva?’, Palaebulgarica, 2, 1978, 2, pp.64-5
46 ‘If you put these instructions before the brethren, you will be a good minister of Christ Jesus, nourished on the words of the faith and of the good doctrine which you have followed’ (1 Timothy 4:6).
47 Uchitel’noe evangelie, 13th century, Gifl’. no.32, RNB, fol.9v
48 Lavrov, Materialy, p.123
When the writer asks for the expansive word he requests it 'now'. 'Now' occurs three times in the text of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript. First, 'now' appears in his entreaty for the expansive word, and second, in the disputed line 'ἈΛΘΗΤΩ ἘΩ ΝΩΜΗ. Η ΚΑΡΕΝΙΛΣΚΟ ΠΑΣΜΑ'. Kuev interprets this line as the poem's sole metaphor, citing it as a striking example of Konstantin's poetic skill, especially given that he deliberately places it at the thematic and emotional climax of the poem. Apart from the Synodal manuscript the line invariably begins with 'Ἡ' or 'Ἦ', and in at least nine manuscripts the meaning is somewhat different, 'ἈΛΘΗΤΩ ἘΩ ΝΩΜΗ ΚΑΡΕΝΙΛΣΚΟ ΠΑΣΜΑ'. 49 Whether the latter or the former reading is favoured as more authentic, 'now' clearly signals the moment of opportunity for the Slavs who hear the Gospel word. Third, the word 'now' also occurs in the disputed line, ' bụ t h b o  nliha C A 0 B 6 N B C K 0 Whether the latter or the former reading is favoured as more authentic, 'now' clearly signals the moment of opportunity for the Slavs who hear the Gospel word. Following after his teacher was evidently an immediate and momentous experience for the writer. The identity of this teacher is a point of contention. Only the Synodal manuscript gives the option of the dual case in the next line, 'ἹΜΗΝΝ ἩΝ Η ΔΕΑΝ ΠΙΝΑΚΑΝ'. 50 Kuev is one of the few critics to argue that the dual case 'Ἡ' is a distinctive feature of the original poem and refers to Cyril and Methodius as Konstantin's teachers. The other manuscripts depict the speaker following his teacher's name and deed, where the object is in the

49 Nos. 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 30, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40 include this line while nos. 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 30, 39, 40 offer the second reading. Stoianov argues that in instances where the line reads 'ἈΝΤ', the jat' in the root indicates that it should read 'ἈΛΘΗΤΩ' and not 'ἈΛΘΗΤΩ'. Copyists, however, were not always meticulous in differentiating between 'Η' and 'Ἦ'. See S. Stoianov, 'Otnosno raznocheteneto letit'/let' ti v azbuchnata molitva', Ezik i literatura, 30, 1975, 5, pp.26-35.

50 Only two other manuscripts incorporate 'now' in this line, nos. 6 and 34. Manuscripts of Zykov's second redaction follow the pattern 'ἸΧΩΤΕΝ ΘΕΙΑ ΠΛΗΡΗΚΙ ΧΡΗΣΜΑ'. This is found in no.4 and a similar rendering in nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 30, 35, 36 & 39. Two manuscripts introduce a new word at the beginning of the line, 'ἸΧΩΤΕΝ ΘΕΙΑ ΠΛΗΡΗΚΙ ΧΡΗΣΜΑ' and 'ἸΧΩΤΕΝ ΘΕΙΑ ΠΛΗΡΗΚΙ ΧΡΗΣΜΑ ΜΗ ΓΝΩΡΙΑΝ', nos. 37 & 40 respectively.

51 Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 32, 33, 38, and 41 include the third personal possessive singular pronoun 'his' either in the genitive or dative case.
singular, 'ἡμών ἐγὼ καὶ ἄλλη παράδειγμα'.

Zykov interprets 'following his name and deed' as a probable reference to Cyril, Konstantin's namesake. From the phrase 'ἡμών ἐγὼ καὶ ἄλλη παράδειγμα', Zykov surmises that the prayer was written as Konstantin contemplated his translation of the commentary, seeing in Cyril, as translator of the evangelarium, his example. Georgiev agrees that the original form was 'ἡμών', but posits that the teacher in view is Christ. Whether that teacher is Christ, Methodius, Cyril or both brothers, and whether he follows his name and deed in a literal or metaphorical sense, is not obvious. What he states with certainty is his intention that following after his teacher he will make plain the Gospel word, 'ὁ ἑκάστῳ ἐνθ'εύμερο ἐγκαθέσαν αὐτὸν.'

How will Konstantin make the Gospel word plain, and what form will it take? He has revealed the instrument of his work as the written word. He has prayed already for help so that he can begin recounting the content of the Gospels and its wonderful miracles:

Целомар'ахо, да нычн'я пишат.

Where the final scene of Konstantin's prayer pictures both young and old praising God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit in a new tongue. The God of all creation, invoked at the beginning as 'Εορκά τριάν ἐν θαυματεύον', is fittingly glorified by all creation at the close of the prayer, 'Χερσ'ορ κисть н д'р'ажа н слага./ Отъ

---

52 Cited from no.2. The only manuscripts which do not contain 'ἐγὼ' or 'τὸν ἑμαυ' offer a significantly different reading, nos. 6, 17 (entire line is omitted), 19, 25, 29 (a different line), 31, 33 & 41.

53 Zykov points out that 'teacher' can also be understood in a figurative sense. See E.G. Zykov, 'Русская переселка древне-болгарского стихотворения', TODL, 28, 1974, pp.308-16.

54 Why, Georgiev questions, would the postscript to the translation of the four sermons against Arius describe Konstantin as a disciple of Methodius, when Cyril was the more prominent of the two and the most obvious choice. Georgiev marshalls a number of other arguments to support his thesis. See Emil Georgiev, Dve proizvedeniia na Sv. Kirila, (Studia Historico-Philologica Serdicensia Supplementi 2), Sofia, 1938 and Kiril i Mefodii - osnovopolazhnitsi na slavianskite literaturi, Sofia, 1956.
Mankind enraptured in praise of God’s glory is the ultimate vision resulting from the revelation of the Gospel word.

What was the original literary setting of the *Alphabetical prayer*? One line of argument concentrates on the fact that the prayer is in the form of an alphabetical acrostic, concluding that it therefore must have been intended as a didactic aid (most manuscripts begin each line with the appropriate letter of the alphabet so that the text looks as though it belongs in a primer). A comparison of the *Alphabetical prayer* with other early alphabetical acrostics, however, reveals marked differences. The most obvious difference is that the writer of the *Alphabetical prayer* asks for the word, while writers of other acrostics tend to expound basic Christian doctrine. Two of the redactions of ‘ΛΑΘΕΣ ΕΙΣΑΔΕΙ ΕΙΣΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΟΝ ΕΚΤ’ (an acrostic sometimes attributed to Cyril) concentrate on basic Christian teaching, the different fate of the wicked and the righteous, and the crucifixion of Christ. Similarly the acrostics ‘ΑΛΘΕΝ ΕΙΣΑΔΕΙ ΕΙΣΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΟΝ ΕΚΤ’ and ‘ΛΑΝΤΕ ΕΙΣΑΔΕΙ ΕΙΣΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΟΝ ΕΚΤ’ concern the character of God, his coming to earth, his rejection by the Jews, and ultimately the praise given him by Christians. ‘ΑΛΘΕΝ ΕΙΣΑΔΕΙ ΕΙΣΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΟΝ ΕΚΤ’ charts the fall of Adam and then Christ’s death which destroys the results of the fall. The acrostic ‘ΑΛΘΕΝ ΠΡΙΧΕ Υ ΓΩΝΑΔΕ ΕΙΣΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΟΝ ΕΚΤΑΙ’ initially appears closer to the *Alphabetical prayer* in its emphasis on wisdom. Like Konstantin, the writer also comments on the tool of his work, ‘ΛΑΘΕΝ ΕΙΣΑΔΕΙ ΕΙΣΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΟΝ ΕΚΤ’.

As the acrostic develops, however, it focusses on Christ’s incarnation and offer of salvation. Thematically, as well as through its accumulation of statements, this acrostic represents a

---

55 Twenty-nine manuscripts place the letters before each line while nine manuscripts, including the Synodal manuscript, show the letters as an integral part of each line, nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 18, 21, 23, 24, 38.
56 N.S. Demkova & N.F. Droblenkova, 'K izucheniiu slavianskikh azbuchnykh stikhov', *TODL*, 23, 1968, (hereafter Demkova & Droblenkova, 'K izucheniiu'), pp.54-7. It is difficult date these alphabetical acrostics since they have been altered and revised. There is evidence to suggest that some were originally composed during the ninth and tenth centuries.
57 Demkova & Droblenkova, 'K izucheniiu', pp.58-60
58 Demkova & Droblenkova, 'K izucheniiu', pp.60-1
59 Demkova & Droblenkova, 'K izucheniiu', pp.57-8
work complete in itself. By contrast, the *Alphabetical prayer* points to a further work in which the speaker will elucidate the Gospel word.

Bearing in mind the possible didactic purpose of most alphabetical acrostics, scholars have examined how faithfully they reflect the names of letters. There are numerous instances of the name 'ΑΟΒΛΔΙ' corresponding to its letter 'A', being placed as the first word of the line. Likewise, the name 'ΙΚΕΛΘΒ' corresponds with its letter 'T' and begins the line in all the acrostics save one. Significantly, the *Alphabetical prayer*, which is the main focus of this chapter, includes neither 'ΑΟΒΛΔΙ' nor 'ΙΚΕΛΘΒ' as the initial words of a line, even though the word 'ΙΚΕΛΘΒ' occurs at five other points in the prayer.

One prayer found in the *Iaroslav miscellany*, an alphabetical acrostic arranged in distichs, can be seen to resemble the *Alphabetical prayer*. The ordering of the letters roughly follows that of the *Alphabetical prayer*, reflecting a Glagolitic orientation. Thematically, however, it belongs to penitential literature. In comparison with other alphabetical acrostics, the *Alphabetical prayer* belongs neither to didactic literature, which inculcates the central tenets of the Christian faith by means of the letters of the alphabet, nor to the body of penitential literature. It therefore stems from a different context.

The *Alphabetical prayer* is found generally in three different literary contexts. In seven manuscripts the *Alphabetical prayer* is linked to a prose preface, which consists of an introduction to a Gospel commentary of Sunday sermons. A number of manuscripts place it among other prayers, while the majority incorporate the *Alphabetical prayer* as part of a

---


61 In the second redaction of 'ΑΛΒΟΛΔΙ ΚΕΛΘΒ ΙΚΕΛΘΒ ΚΕΛΘΒ', however, the line for 'T' reads 'ΚΕΛΘΒ ΓΡΕΧ' (Demkova & Drobenkova, 'K izucheniiu', p.57).

62 Several manuscripts of the *Alphabetical prayer* show traces being remodelled to fit the pattern of other alphabetical acrostics. For example, no.17 begins, 'ΑΛΒΟΛΔΙ ΚΕΛΘΒ ΙΚΕΛΘΒ ΚΕΛΘΒ, ΕΙΜΙ ΔΙΑΚΟΣΤΗΤΗΣ ΕΙΚΟΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΝΤΕΚΤΗΜ'.

63 Chasoslov or molitvoslov, 13th century, no.15481, Iaroslavskii istoriko-architekturnyi muzei-zapovednik, biblioteka, (commonly known as the *Iaroslav miscellany*, hereafter *la misc*), fols.207-10.
compilatory work. This last work is clearly of later provenance, comprising a mosaic of excerpts and facts which relate to the formation of the Slavonic language and the baptism of Rus'. From these three contexts, I would suggest that Konstantin's translation of the Gospel commentary is the most likely one for the *Alphabetical prayer*. This suggestion is not based exclusively on the word which has been seen to run through the *Alphabetical prayer*, but also on a consideration of the Synodal manuscript. Before looking at the arrangement of the prologue title, the *Alphabetical prayer*, and prose preface more closely, I will consider the context of the Gospel commentary.

The thirteenth-century Synodal manuscript is the only manuscript which presents the *Alphabetical prayer* and the Gospel commentary as a united work. Moreover, it is the earliest manuscript of the *Alphabetical prayer*. Two other manuscripts of Konstantin's translation of the Gospel commentary are known, neither of which include the *Alphabetical prayer* or the prose preface. The absence of the prayer and preface in these manuscripts gives weight to the opinion that the Gospel commentary did not originally incorporate them. A closer scrutiny of these manuscripts, however, reveals additional factors that help refute this view. First, the beginning of the so-called Hilferding manuscript is missing. Second, the text of the translation of the Gospel commentary in these two manuscripts appears to have been changed to a greater degree than the text of the Synodal manuscript. Mikhailov has made a preliminary study comparing the so-called Vienna manuscript, dating from the fourteenth-century with excerpts from the other two thirteenth-century manuscripts of the Gospel

---

64 Kuev dates this compilatory work the end of the fourteenth, beginning of the fifteenth century, when there is evidently an upsurge of interest in the creation of the Slavonic letters (*Azbuchnata molitva*, pp.82-4 & pp.147-8). The *Alphabetical prayer* occurs in conjunction with the prose preface in nos. 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 30, 39, among other prayers or acrostics in nos. 6, 9, 10, 34, 36, 37 with no.31 in a book of canons. In the majority of other manuscripts the prayer is interleaved into the story about the beginning of Slavonic letters (except for nos. 16, 17, 19, 35, 40). For an example of the account of the creation of the Slavonic language see no.2 in Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva*, p.191.

65 Uchitel'noe evangelie, 13th century, Gilf', no.32, RNB
commentary. Among other differences, he argues that the Vienna and Hilferding manuscripts tend to make transitions between sections smoother and to depersonalize the text, a tendency even more pronounced in the Vienna manuscript. These changes suggest to him the hand of a later editor.

Thematically the Alphabetical prayer has already been shown to fit the context of the introduction to Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary. A comparison of his translated sermons with their Greek prototypes reveals that Konstantin added his own introductions and conclusions to each sermon, except the first, which will be discussed below. These additions display his zeal for the intelligible communication of the Gospel word. Introductions are often a eulogy to the words of God, and Konstantin works hard to make his potentially dry and abstract words tangible and immediate through vivid similes and metaphors. He compares listening to God’s words to attending a sumptuous banquet, and those who listen attentively he likens to people enriched with treasure. Echoing the Psalmist’s cry, Konstantin declares that God’s words are sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, and he urges his hearers to delight in them. Not content with his listeners merely becoming sated with God’s words, Konstantin admonishes them to share the words with others. This sentiment echoes the preface with its emphasis on sharing God’s words and proclaiming his mercy and truth. Konstantin’s conclusions tend to enjoin people to good works with the aim of attaining the joy of heaven. Less emphasis is placed on the torment of hell as a motivation which should spur...

---

67 See Antonii, Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi, pp.164-78.
68 Antonii, Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi. See 28th sermon pp.201-2 & 41st sermon p.220.
69 Antonii, Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi, p.218, 37th sermon.
70 'Безмислениците перестают источники исповедания превращать душу и святую от предельных и непогрешимых слов дела и времени, по пути владыче, и владыче.' (Antonii, Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi, 14th sermon, p.194).
71 'И глаголим оныя Господа трехразими Духом... и питамы шестием токи, но истинны токи отъ сего мнения и источникъ ныя токъ братии мнен по среде же церкви всхоже та.' (Kiev, Azbuchnata moliva, p.189).
them on to good deeds. A similar accent on joy and the word in the Alphabetical prayer contributes to the impression that the prayer fits well as the prologue to Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary.

The manuscripts of Zykov’s second redaction of the Alphabetical prayer are set either with other prayers and works of varied character, or in six manuscripts the prayer is placed in conjunction with the prose preface which in also found in the Synodal manuscript. Five of these six manuscripts also contain a Gospel commentary, though not the one translated by Konstantin, but a later and increasingly more popular translation of Sunday sermons by the fourteenth-century Byzantine writer Patriarch Philotheus. Only one manuscript positions the Alphabetical prayer and prose preface as an introduction to the sermons of Philotheus’ commentary, while in four manuscripts the prayer is placed near the end, or even as the last item of the manuscript. By placing the Alphabetical prayer and preface later in a manuscript, the role of introduction which they fulfill in the Synodal manuscript is lost. Significantly, in two manuscripts the prose preface is followed by Konstantin’s translation of the Easter sermon, the first sermon of the Gospel commentary as recorded in the Synodal manuscript. This suggests that the original manuscript from which these last two derived contained Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary, rather than the later commentary by Philotheus.

The prologue title, which is seen to describe the Alphabetical prayer in the Synodal manuscript, is another significant pointer which links the prayer and the prose preface specifically to Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary. In the six manuscripts where the prayer linked to the prose preface, the prologue title is placed before an intervening heading,

---

72 At the close of the 23rd sermon Konstantin refers to the Last Day as one of joy, ‘Δα και όλα

73 In four manuscripts the Alphabetical prayer is given no separate heading, and in three manuscripts it occurs among prayers which are grouped under a general heading such as 'Αληθινά.

74 No. 11 places it as an introduction while 4, 15, 30 & 39 insert it at or near the end.

75 Nos. 12 & 15.
such as, "Молитва Константина Философа сътворена досюко". This second heading now appears to describe to the prayer rather than the prologue title. By contrast, the Synodal manuscript omits any additional heading so that the prologue title is seen to describe the prayer: "Пролог о Христе сътворенъ сказаніе святаго евангелия сътворенъ Костантінъ имыже и преложеніе еясть тогаде сказаніе сказаніе нымиласкалаго". Does this title make sense as a description of the Alphabetical prayer? It can be interpreted in the following way. The prologue is in verse (сътворенъ) like the Alphabetical prayer, and is attributed to Konstantin (сътворенъ Костантінъ). It concerns Christ and acts as a prologue to the story of the holy Gospel. In other words while the prayer itself does not narrate the Gospel story, it does concern Christ in its address to the Trinity and in its petition for help to make plain the Gospel word. Implicit in the title is the fact that the prayer serves as a prologue to the story of the Gospel which is told in the translated sermons of the Gospel commentary (note the use of the instrumental pronoun, 'имыже и преложеніе еясть', and the reference to 'предложеніе...тогаде сказаніе'). Thus the prologue title of the Synodal manuscript can be seen to describe the Alphabetical prayer as a prologue to the Gospel story which is expounded subsequently in Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary.

By contrast, the prologue title in the other six manuscripts which include the Alphabetical prayer and preface, differs in small but important ways: "Пролог о Христѣ сътворенъ, сказаніе святаго евангелія, сътворенъ Костантінъ, имы же принеложен сказаніе се и евангелій нѣдѣлныхъ". The nominative case of 'сказаніе', rather than the genitive case in the Synodal manuscript (сказанія), implies a separate work which relates the story of the holy

---

76 Manuscripts which include the Alphabetical prayer as a part of the later compilatory work about the origins of the Slavonic language begin with an introductory phrase such as, 'сие рев святый Книга'. None of the manuscripts which belong to Zykov’s second redaction open in this way. Instead they begin with a title such as, 'Молитва Константина Философа сътворена досюко'.

77 Kuev, Azbuchnata molitva, p.186, no.1
78 Kuev, Azbuchnata molitva, p.198, no.4
Gospel. Although the *Alphabetical prayer* is about Christ (ὦ Χριστῷ), it can not be described accurately as the story of the holy Gospel (σημάνεις Σωτῆρος ἐванεύμενος). The introduction of the relative pronoun 'νῦν', rather than 'νῦν ἀλήθεια', and the demonstrative adjective 'εἷς', rather than 'τόν ἀγαθόν', also reinforces the impression that the translation of the fifty Gospel sermons is an independent work from the story of the holy Gospel found in the prologue. If the prologue title does not accurately describe the *Alphabetical prayer* as a prologue to the story of the Gospels, it is not surprising that an additional title should appear before the prayer such as 'Μωναθέα Κωνστάντινα φιλοσοφοφόρα φιλοτέφθα αὐτοτρόφος Ἀ δ' Εὐκρύς'. With this extra title, the prologue title would have seemed redundant and confusing as it would no longer reflect the relationship between the *Alphabetical prayer* and the Gospel commentary.

One further point about the prologue title strengthens the link between the *Alphabetical prayer* and Konstantin's Gospel commentary. Whereas the Synodal manuscript contains fifty translated sermons as specified in the prologue title (one is Konstantin's own composition), Philotheus' Gospel commentary, to which the *Alphabetical prayer* and prose preface were subsequently attached, comprises fifty-two Sunday sermons (plus extra sermons for feastdays). All six manuscripts which contain the prologue title, the *Alphabetical prayer* and prose preface, specify fifty translated sermons (although some of them mistakenly insert the letter 'η' instead of 'ν' for fifty).  

79 Thus only the prologue title of the Synodal manuscript is seen to describe the prayer and its relation to Konstantin's translation of the Gospel commentary accurately (even though it does not specify fifty translated sermons but conveys this information in the preface).  

80 By contrast other prologue titles imply two tellings of the Gospel story and incorrectly specify fifty Sunday sermons, whereas

---

79 Nos. 15, 11 and 39 insert the letter 'η'.
80 In the Synodal manuscript the number of sermons is also specified as eight 'η' rather than fifty 'ν', evidently a scribal mistake.
Philotheus’ commentary contains fifty-two. Having considered the various literary settings for the Alphabetical prayer, first as a didactic acrostic, then in the later contexts of a compilatory work on the origins of the Slavonic language, and last a foreword or even an afterword to Philotheus’ commentary, it emerges that the most likely setting for the prayer is as a prologue to Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary.

Zykov also argues that the Alphabetical prayer was composed as a prologue to the Gospel commentary. As internal evidence for the link between the commentary and the Alphabetical prayer, Zykov quotes ‘и notwithstanding the personal addition of the poet and the poet’s emotions, the reference to sadness, he observes, must have reflected Konstantin’s frame of mind when he was about to begin his work. Zykov concludes that Konstantin worked on his commentary at the beginning of the 890s in order to elucidate the Gospels translated by Cyril. In addition, he argues that the prose preface, perceived by later scribes to be a separate work, served originally as the introduction to the first sermon. This, he suggests, would make the opening line of the preface, ‘доколе есть весть, братие...’, the beginning of a sermon. Assuming that the preface was composed as a part of the first sermon, he therefore supposes that the Alphabetical prayer was written after Konstantin finished translating, and certainly after he wrote the third sermon, which Zykov suspects provided its thematic basis.

From the prayer, however, it appears that Konstantin had not yet begun his great work of translation, since he asks for help to begin writing. There is also no reason why the prayer included in the third sermon should have inspired the Alphabetical prayer rather than the reverse. With regard to the first sermon, there may be another explanation for the absence of an

81 E.G. Zykov, “Азбучна молитва” в ее отношенii к “учителю евангелии” Константина Пселавского’ in Kulturnoe nasledie drevnei Rusi, Istoki stanovlenia traditsii, ed. V.G. Bazanov Moscow, 1976, pp.363-8, notes that the prologue was also a device used also by Ioan Ekzarkh and by the writers of the 1073 Izbornik and of Zlatostru.

82 Iu. Trifonov, ‘Belezhki vuru Uchiteno evangelie na episkopa Konstantina’ in Sbornik v chest na Vasil N. Zlatarski po sluchai 30-go-dishnata mu nauchna i profesorska deinost, prigoven ot negovite uchenitsi i pochitateli, Sofia, 1925, pp.459-79
introduction. Without any preliminary remarks, it begins with the question,

"чего ради инии евангелисти отъ съмртения намаца и се въмласъ посмѣю начать рѣкъ

"и Свого палѣть бысть", а другое все мимо течь запачати, ржыы, еъшнѣнѣ, еъздѣчнии?"83 It is noteworthy that Konstantin’s conclusion, like his beginning, is also abrupt and lacks the usual exhortation to good deeds.84 At the climax of the Christian calendar, when the logos himself is revealed, Konstantin appears to have left the sermon unadorned by his own comments. Thus there is no compelling evidence to suggest that the prayer was written as a prologue following the work of translation. The prayer, however, can be seen to dovetail with the prose preface. The opening line,

"дѣшо есть отъ Бога начинати и до Бога кончавати", is a quotation which Konstantin attributes to St Gregory (of Nazianzus). Although Konstantin is always quick to acknowledge his sources, here it is of particular relevance since he is quoting the first line of an alphabetical acrostic prayer written by St Gregory.85 In this way Konstantin may be indirectly acknowledging the model for his prayer. The notion of beginning also finds an echo in the prayer itself as the author seeks divine help in order to begin writing about God’s miracles. The prose preface informs Konstantin’s audience of his motivation. Initially he considers various exhortations from Scriptures which command people to study and proclaim God’s word. At the end of the preface Konstantin returns to the theme of his first sentence. His final request is that his hearers pray for him so that God will enable him to complete what he has promised, ‘дѣ конца екращитъ обѣшании’.86 His desire is not only to begin but to finish his work of translation.

83Antonii, Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi, pp.178-9
84 He concludes the Easter sermon with the words, ‘намѣрѣ свѣка и чисть и покланание, достоинъ Сына и пречинати и жинеати* Аѳрхъ вѣ всевѣ свѣтаня, нынѣ и прыгъ и вѣ бекончанѣ вѣ амѣнъ’ (Antonii, Iz istorii khristianskoi propovedi, p.191).
85 ‘Архѣнъ агванов кой тельос понов Феонъ’ (J.P. Migne, Patrologiae graeca, 37, 1857, cols. 908-10).
86 Kuev, Azbuchnata molitva, p.189. In Konstantin’s translation of the sermons there are other references to the promise which he has made.
Although the points mentioned above speak for the antiquity of the Synodal manuscript, there is other evidence which suggests that the prose preface in the Synodal manuscript may have undergone more extensive editing than the other six manuscripts which contain the prayer and prose preface. For example, variants in the text of the prose preface in the other six manuscripts, are less marked in comparison with the Synodal manuscript. On the whole, the manuscripts reproduce the same reading and only the Egorov manuscript breaks off with the words ‘сказаний Святого Евангелия предложити в грецеска языка въ славенеска’, omitting further details of Konstantin’s personal struggles and his promise to complete his task. By contrast, the Synodal manuscript enhances the humility topos in one section and fails to mention Naum, one of the visionaries of the early Bulgarian Church and a contemporary of Konstantin.

In the other six manuscripts Naum is named as the one who urged Konstantin to do this work, and he does not abase himself in the same way as above:

Константинъ абаже вься на се темни проненин, брать Наем... абаже вься накоже речь на сказаний Святого Евангелия предложити въ грецеска языка

---

87 For example, using no.11 as the principal text, in the six manuscripts there are variant readings between individual words and phrases such as, ‘лю бранин Михаил Константинъ Ивов’ (no.12) instead of ‘милостив Михаил Константинъ’, ‘въ гръцки’ in place of ‘въ гръцки’, (nos. 12, 4 and 30) and ‘съ всич чели’ instead of ‘съ всич чели’ (no.12) rather than ‘съ всич чели’.

88 K. Kuev, Novootkriti prepisi na Azbuchnata molitva, Palaeobulgarica, 3, 1979, 4, p.28

89 Kuev, Azbuchnata molitva, p.339. Incidentally, only the Egorov manuscript omits an additional title for the prose preface which the other five include as ‘предложити въ гръцеска языка’.

90 Kuev, Azbuchnata molitva, p.189. Kuev omits a section of the prose preface which can be found in his reproduction of several folia of the manuscript (p.310).
Naum’s name is a further fragment of evidence linking the prose preface to the same period as the *Alphabetical prayer*. This suggests that the reading given in the six later manuscripts may have preserved elements of the original which are missing in the Synodal manuscript.

The Synodal manuscript presents something of an anomaly. On the one hand, the prologue title in the Synodal manuscript has been shown to describe accurately the relationship between the *Alphabetical prayer* and the Gospel commentary, underscoring the reliability of the manuscript. On the other hand, the text of the prose preface in the Synodal manuscript appears to have been altered, indicating that it also may have been subject to more editorial change than previously thought. These observations both reinforce the view that the prayer was composed as a prologue for the Gospel commentary, though using fresh arguments than in the past. At the same time a closer examination of the prose preface in the Synodal manuscript suggests that antiquity in itself is not always a sufficient basis on which to establish an original reading.

In conclusion the *Alphabetical prayer* can be seen to place greater emphasis on the word than has been generally recognized. Set in the literary context of Konstantin’s translation of a commentary on the Gospels, the prayer forms part of his wider vision to expound the Gospel word. This understanding and goal is wholly in keeping with literature originating from the period of the nascent Slav Church in Moravia and Pannonia, and then in Bulgaria. The concept of the *logos* was of first importance for Cyril and Methodius’ mission since it underlay the universal mission of the Church. In previous centuries the *logos* had been crucial to the Christian apology for the Trinity, and now it remained a key concept in Cyril and Methodius’ expositions of the Christian faith to the young Slav Church and to people of

---

91 Uchitel’noe evangelie, 16th century, Solov. 157/157, RNB, fol.13
other faiths. Hagiographers and translators evidently appreciated the word in its literal and theological meaning as *logos*. The *Vita Constantini* portrays Cyril as a man who values the word on a variety of different levels in his work as linguist, missionary *cum* diplomat, and teacher. Methodius too, is shown to be wise and orthodox in his teaching. Theophylact's *Vita Clementis* employs wordplays relating to the *logos*, while Ioan Ekzarkh’s works display a clear grasp of the Johannine distinction between the transcendence of the *logos* and the finiteness of man as reflected in the verbal tenses used in the Greek.

‘Slovo’ occurs five times in the *Alphabetical prayer* where it signifies, I suggest, neither exclusively artistic inspiration nor a reference to the cult of the word. On each occasion the writer is shown to qualify his use of ‘slovo’. It progresses from the Slavonic word of human communication to a cry for the living Spirit to inspire his heart, from his need for the ‘expansive’ word culminating in his elucidation of the Gospel word. Such a petition complements the prose preface and forms an appropriate introduction to Konstantin’s translation of the Gospel commentary. While manuscript evidence supports the linking of the *Alphabetical prayer* with the preface, clearly a degree of caution is needed when tackling the Synodal manuscript.

Appropriately, in the comparatively early stages of the Slavonic mission, the focus of the *Alphabetical prayer* is on the Gospel word. This emphasis reflects a period of active mission with its logocentric spirituality. As well as receiving liturgical books, any nation formerly considered ‘barbarian’ which now possessed a language of worship gained enormous advantages in the political and cultural spheres. Destined to take root and flourish in Rus’, the Slavonic word was instrumental in communicating the written word, and in particular the *logos*.
Vladimir I: prayers of a sinner and saint

Vladimir I's baptism represented a watershed in the perception of Rus' as a nation. The problem for writers of the eleventh century and later, was how to portray baptism as an event marking a personal act of faith and a national turning-point in the life of Rus', potentially combining an image of humble repentance with one of military and political strength. In this chapter I shall explore the inclusion of literary prayers in the various works devoted to Vladimir as one of the devices used by the writers of Rus' to depict the inner transformation which was assumed to have accompanied his baptism.

The sources recording Vladimir's baptism and the baptism of Rus' are notoriously problematic. Contemporary Graeco-Byzantine sources are striking by their silence, while other foreign commentators tended to concentrate on the external events surrounding Vladimir's baptism, ignoring the possibility of sincere inner change. In particular they noted the Byzantine emperors' urgent need of troops from Rus', coupled with a barely conceivable offer of marriage to a porphyrogenite princess, which may have seemed too tangled up with Vladimir's baptism to speak of true Christian repentance in this instance.

Writers living in Rus' also struggled to ascertain and interpret the events surrounding Vladimir's baptism. Of their accounts, three key records of Vladimir's conversion and baptism survive. None of the writers, it appears, were contemporary to the events they describe. For example, over half a century after Vladimir's baptism, Ilarion celebrated the event in the

---

1 See A. Poppe, 'How the conversion of Rus' was understood in the eleventh century' *HUS*, 11, 1987, pp.287-302
eulogy attached to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. Another record is the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala*. This last work incorporates fragments dating possibly from the eleventh or twelfth century, but which in its present form may represent a thirteenth or even fourteenth-century compilation. In the third part of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* the writer puts into Vladimir’s mouth three prayers uttered at major junctures: one after Vladimir’s baptism, a second before his capture of Kherson, and a third spoken on his deathbed. The third account of Vladimir’s baptism is given a prominent place in the *Povest’ vremennykh let*, which was completed in 1118, over a century after Vladimir’s baptism.

Before focussing on the texts of the prayers, it is worth bearing in mind some of the obstacles their writers faced. One of the most serious obstacles writers after Ilianion encountered was the differences in their sources. For instance, the chronicler acknowledges the existence of other versions of Vladimir’s baptism which support Kiev or the nearby town of Vasiliev as the place of baptism, but he dismisses these as unreliable. His own preferred location is the Greek colony of Kherson. Yet such a preference is then cast in an uncertain light by the writer of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* who supposes that Vladimir was already baptized in Rus’. Such discrepancies affect interpretation too.

---


3 *Се же не судаще право глаголать, неко крещение есть в Киеве, и нине же реща е Владими, дрзим же иже немо оказать* (PVLL, col.111). References to ‘the chronicler’ can be misleading since the *Povest’ vremennykh let* was compiled neither by one person nor at one time. Nevertheless, for ease of reference I shall refer to ‘the chronicler’ from time to time.

4 Poppe argues convincingly that Vladimir’s attack on Kherson was part of the Emperors’ strategy to counter the threat of two troublesome usurpers. In return for Vladimir’s help, he is granted the hand of Anna on the condition that he and his country are baptized. Such a sequence of events is corroborated by the brief chronicle records listed at the end of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala*. See A. Poppe, ‘The political background to the baptism of Rus’. Byzantine-Russian relations between 986-989’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 30, 1976, pp.197-244. For a critique of Poppe’s argument see D. Obolensky, ‘Kherson and the conversion of Rus’: an anti-revisionist view’, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 13, 1989, pp.244-56.
In depicting Vladimir’s change of heart, the writers also touched on the factors which led to his decision. How much, for example, depended on Vladimir’s own intelligence and desire, and how much was due to God’s sovereign intervention? Or in the Povest’ vremennykh let account, what role did the Greek philosopher’s lengthy explanation of Christian doctrine, the emissaries’ glowing report of Christianity, the capture of Kherson, Vladimir’s sudden blindness and Anna’s timely persuasion play in his conversion and baptism? Behind these questions lies the conundrum facing the writer of what weight to allow human choice and what weight to give divine will. One extreme exalts Vladimir but undermines divine initiative, the other extreme unfolds the workings of providence through a multitude of factors but threatens to turn Vladimir into a robotic participant. Writers also sought to develop the new era of Christian history out of past achievements. The baptism of the Rus’ brought about a change involving a radical re-evaluation of the past which cut to the heart of the Rus’ identity. In forming a national identity it was important for the writers not to undermine past achievements and reputation. Likewise the link with Byzantium had to be considered. Whilst indebted to Byzantium for the example of Christian faith, Rus’ was keen to maintain an independent identity. Swirled in contrary directions by seemingly contradictory interests, writers used literary prayers as a useful interpretative tool.

There was another question which concerned the writers. How could they promote Vladimir’s veneration? Vladimir was not immediately venerated and canonized after his death, unlike his sons Boris and Gleb around whom a local and then national cult flourished. When Vladimir gained national recognition as a saint is a vexed question. Poppe dates such veneration between 1283 and 1311. Given his pivotal importance in the

---

5 Poppe notes that Vladimir is not mentioned as a saint in the first redaction of the vita of Aleksandr Nevskii of 1283, but that in 1311 a stone church in Novgorod is dedicated to St Vladimir, indicating that he was officially canonized by that time. See A. Poppe, ‘Stanovlenie pochitania Vladimira Velikogo’ in Spornyey voprosy otechestvennoi istorii XI-XVIII vekov. Tezisy, dokladov i soobshchenii pervykh chtenii, posviashchennoi A.A. Zimina.
formation of a national religious identity, why were people apparently slow to venerate him? Certainly the lack of posthumous miracles was one obstacle. Both Ilarion and the writer of the third part of *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* address this problem in their works. The chronicler bemoans the lack of miracles and then reproaches himself and his audience for their lack of fervour in remembering him, citing that as perhaps one obstacle. In efforts to establish Vladimir’s sanctity, prayers were one device which could be introduced into a text, offering a more orthodox and convincing portrayal of his baptism.

While Ilarion’s eulogy in the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* does not include prayers, it does show a way of harmonizing potentially discordant notes. Therefore I will briefly consider it as a model which integrates the different aspects of Vladimir’s baptism, before going on to look at the accounts which include prayers. For example, Ilarion’s eulogy offers a way of explaining the relationship between the external rite of baptism and the required inner transformation, of reconciling Vladimir’s past and present condition, fairly apportioning the role of his own initiative and of divine intervention.

Prior to conversion Ilarion depicts Vladimir as a just and wise ruler of illustrious descent. In his search for faith, understanding (*razum’*) and initiative play an important role. Ilarion describes the first step of coming to know God as the divine illumining of human understanding, ‘и ея разумь въ сердце его, како разумьется сокр. идольская льсть, взыскать единого Бога святрьшаго въ таьрь’.

The same process applies to all the people of Rus’ whereby God is seen to shine the light of understanding into human hearts,

---


6 ‘Да аще враги имели петцыны и июля приклони Богу да не в день престав ими и вида бо Богъ тилицы наша к намъ, прослави ея и’ (*PVII*, col. 131).

burning longing that he and his country should become Christian is matched by God's fixed purpose and desire. No hiatus separates the word from the deed, 'е<у>д.Aл<л> се<г>дашњи, въ<г>ор^<к> д<ж>о^м<к>, иако <б>г<ц]>и < cruz<ц>ал<ц> и <эк>м<к>и ^ц><ц> я. Мне и <к>ь<т>, <б>г^у> тако <из>в<л>енц<л>ь'. Ilarion then elaborates the significance of baptism. The wearing of white clothes for the ceremony symbolizes how Vladimir casts off his old nature, emerging from the baptismal font reclothed in Christ and now a son of the resurrection. The seal of his new identity is stamped by the giving of a new name - Vasilii. Ilarion dwells on the wonder of Vladimir's faith as a miracle. The fact that Vladimir saw neither Christ, nor the apostles, nor any miracles, and yet believed (т<ц> <н>е <вм<л>кер, в<к>ор<к>) is, in Ilarion's eyes, a marvellous miracle. Thus, in character with the overall approach of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati, Ilarion explains Vladimir's conversion and baptism in theologically concise terms, skillfully conveying the delicate balance of factors which led first to Vladimir's baptism and then to the baptism of Rus'.

Neither the Pamiat' i pokhvala, nor the chronicler's account of Vladimir's baptism show as much homogeneity as Ilarion's eulogy. Given the jagged edges of their narrative, both factually and stylistically as works of compilatory character, prayers help to create a more rounded picture of Vladimir. At the outset it is worth noting that the Pamiat' i pokhvala and the account in the Povest' vremennyh let provide different literary settings. The Pamiat' i pokhvala is a memorial and eulogy which focusses on the character and deeds of Vladimir and to a lesser extent on Ol'ga. It does not attempt to give a historical overview. By contrast, the chronicler's account unfolds the sequence of events which culminates in Vladimir's baptism and the baptism of Rus'. The question of how baptism contributes to the new

8 Moldovan, Slovo, p.89, fol.181v
9 Moldovan, Slovo, p.92, fol.186
10 Moldovan, Slovo, p.94, fol.188
Christian identity of Rus’ is seen at times to overshadow the issue of personal sanctity.

The textual history of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala is somewhat obscure. In its longest form the text is composed of three distinct parts: a eulogy to Vladimir, a eulogy to Ol’ga, and thirdly a eulogistic work in praise of Vladimir. Although the third part is not included in the title at the beginning of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala, it contains several nearly identical phrases which also occur in earlier parts of the work. The compilatory character of the work, both as a whole and considered as separate parts, is evident in individual sentences which unnecessarily repeat themselves or reflect clumsy insertions.¹¹ Not all the manuscripts contain the parts of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala in a triptych arrangement. Several manuscripts omit the eulogy to Ol’ga, while others only contain the third part of Pamiat’ i pokhvala in abbreviated form.¹² The abbreviated form of the third part omits the two prayers of penitence attributed to Vladimir which begs the question of whether these prayers are extraneous, possibly added later. Bearing in mind the composite nature of the work, I will look briefly at the concept of baptism in the first part of the work and consider the third part containing three prayers in greater detail.

¹¹ See A.A. Shakhmatov, ‘Korsimskaia legenda o kreshchenii Vladimira’ in Sbornik statei posviashchenykh pochitateliam akademiku i zasluzhennomu professoru V.I. Lamanskogo po sluchaia piatideciatletii ego uchenoi deiatel’nosti, St Petersburg, 1908, 2, (hereafter Shakhmatov, ‘Korsunskaia legenda’), pp 1044-52
¹² The earliest occurrence of the text of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala is found in the Musin-Pushkin miscellany, dated 1414, of which a nineteenth-century copy survives. I shall be quoting from Zimin’s edition, which is based on a manuscript dated 1470s (see Zimin, ‘Pamiat’’, pp.66-75). Bugoslavskii’s edition includes variants from ten manuscripts in addition to his principal manuscript which is dated 1494. Two of the eleven manuscripts omit the eulogy to Ol’ga (variants C and H), while three begin only after the eulogy and bear a different title (variants E, F and K). He divides the manuscripts into long, middle and short redactions. See S.A. Bugoslavskii, ‘K literaturnoi istorii “Pamiat i pokhvaly” kniaziu Vladimiru’, Izvestia otdelenia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti, 29, 1925, (hereafter Bugoslavskii, ‘K literaturnoi istorii’), pp.128-41. In order to identify sections of text belonging to the long redaction, I will refer to the three parts of Pamiat’ i pokhvala as follows: part one incorporates the text from the title to the eulogy to Ol’ga, part two consists of the eulogy to Ol’ga, and part three refers to the text which follows from the eulogy to the end.
Baptism occupies a central position even in the title describing the first part of the *Pamiat' i pokhvala*: ‘како крестися Владимир и дети его крести и всю землю Русскую от конца и до конца’.

Details of when or where or by whom are of secondary importance to the writer. Neither repentance, nor the agency of any Greek delegation, nor political ambition, feature in his conversion. Although Ol’ga’s example is noted as instrumental, events are attributed primarily to God’s inspiration and Vladimir’s longing for baptism, frequently noted by Iakov, ‘яко же жадаетъ олень на источники водные, тако ежада благоверный князь Владимиръ святаго крещения, и бо ею треф хотѣнны быти’.

It continues in a deceptively simple fashion - after Vladimir is baptized he illumines the whole of Rus’ with baptism. Baptism is seemingly unconnected to the prerequisites of faith and repentance and here assumes a significance in its own right. This is surely something of an exaggeration, or at least a simplification. Firstly, Vladimir did not literally baptize people, and secondly, as Ilarion had rightly noted in his eulogy, Vladimir’s apostolic work was restricted to ‘this area’, presumably Kiev and its vicinity. Besides which, the conversion of Rus’ was a gradual process, continuing long after Vladimir’s death. Nevertheless, the baptism was a powerful symbol of change whereby Rus’ could identify itself as a Christian nation. Vladimir’s role is that of an apostle who is depicted in vivid terms as single-handedly snatching Rus’ from the devil’s mouth.

No clear distinction is made between conversion, generally understood nowadays to involve a change of conviction, and baptism, an external rite which conceivably could be performed without such a change. In medieval literature conversion and baptism are often seen as inseparable.

‘Illumination’ is another word which is frequently used when describing conversion.

---

13 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’’, p.67
14 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’’, p.67
15 Ilarion eulogizes Vladimir for turning from delusion not one person, not ten people, not a town, but this whole region ‘ибо ею ведаетъ де’ (Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.96, 190v).
baptism and conversion. The interchangeable use of these terms is encouraged by the Greek terminology for baptism. Arrants notes that in liturgical books the technical term for the act of baptism is enlightenment (photisma) equivalent to the Slavonic 'prosveshchenie'. In the third part of the Pamiat' i pokhvala the two prayers of penitence depict baptism as the means of illumination, ‘но ты мя святым крещением просвети’, and again before Vladimir dies he declares: ‘святым крещением просвети мя еси’. Thus baptism and enlightenment are seen to be part of a single act. This is in contrast to Ilarion, a theologically astute writer, who describes God’s illumination prior to baptism by the verb ‘to shine’ rather than ‘to enlighten’ in ‘свята раджим в сердци его’ and ‘и свята и в нас свея раджма’. In this way he makes a distinction between the initial illumining of human understanding and the act of baptism.

Initially the third part of Pamiat' i pokhvala begins in the manner of the first part, with a record of Vladimir’s baptism and the baptism of Rus’, ‘блажени яже князя Владимира, ближка Олхинъ крестися самь, и чада свое и во всю землю Рукую крести от конца и до конца’. Then the writerdiscloses his motivation - to show that Vladimir is a righteous man not because of his miracles but as a consequence of his good deeds. As well as visible deeds, he highlights Vladimir’s inner qualities. As if to reiterate this point, he quotes Paul’s letter to the Galatians which enumerates the fruit of the Spirit as love, patience, faithfulness, goodness, gentleness and self-control. Not content with the outward record of Vladimir’s baptism, the writer puts two prayers of penitence into his mouth, one just after baptism and the other on his deathbed. Vladimir’s mood is characterized by joy at his baptism and his prayer is seen to explain his change of heart.

---

17 M. Arrants, ‘Chin oglasheniia i kreshcheniia v Drevnei Rusi, Simvol, 19, 1988, p.77 & p.87 n.12, observes that the Slavonic word for baptism ‘kreshchenie’ derives from the word for cross but that etymologically it should have been translated ‘pogruzhение’.
18 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’ , p.70
19 ‘Во имя и впредься в Бог и о святыи крещении и Христе и оление… в радости’ (Zimin, ‘Pamiat’ , p.70).
Vladimir praises the Trinity for inspiring his conversion, which he depicts in a series of simple contrasts. The prayer falls into three sections divided by exclamations of praise to the Trinity. Most of the text is composed as a series of simple sentences and a progression of tenses reflects the different stages of Vladimir’s conversion. In the first instance he highlights God’s role, ‘помянуя я еси и привёл ма еси на свят, и познах тя, вся твари твои’, in which God’s merciful actions are described using the perfect tense. In the second section, aorist verbs are used to depict Vladimir’s change, for example ‘познах’ and ‘блях’, while in the third section he petitions God for mercy, instruction and a knowledge of God’s way and will using the imperative forms ‘помилуй’, ‘настави’ and ‘научи’. In the central section of the prayer Vladimir contrasts his former condition as a pagan, with his present state attained by means of God’s instruction and taming through grace. Confession is intoned in the simple sentences describing his past condition, which are reinforced by verbal rhyme, ‘Ео тым блях... акы зверь, блях, много зла творях в поганьстеств и живах, акы скотина’. The reversal is brought about by God’s intervention, signalled by the repeated phrase ‘но ты мя...’ After the prayer the writer continues to enumerate Vladimir’s good qualities, commenting that he emulated the deeds and lives of holy men.

---

20 Zimin, ‘Pamiat”, p.70
Abraham’s hospitality, Jacob’s truth, Moses’ humility, David’s uprightness and Constantine’s orthodoxy.

Any hint that goodness might signify weakness is dispelled by the remark that all countries feared Vladimir. Indeed, his military successes, including those victories before his baptism, are explained as a blessing that flows from his life of good deeds, ‘тако же предъявляю князь Володимеро в добрых делах, благодаю богом просвещенное сердце его, и рука господня помогает ему’. Kherson too is listed among his conquests. Rather than provide the setting for Vladimir’s baptism, the capture of Kherson is an answer to the prayer of a prince who is already a keen exponent of the Christian faith:

Господи боже владыко всих, сего у тебе прошю: дай мне грады, да приму и да приведу люди крестянны и попы на свою землю, и да научат люди закону крестьянскому’.

Once he has defeated Kherson, Vladimir asks for the hand of the Emperors’ sister in order to further his programme of Christianization. There is no hint here that Vladimir is driven to baptism either by the miraculous capture of Kherson or by Anna’s persuasive words. Vladimir’s inner goodness is outwardly validated by the spoils of ecclesiastical artifacts, icons, relics and presents which he takes both from the captured town of Kherson and from the emperors.

On Vladimir’s deathbed, the writer records his final prayer.

Господи боже мой, не позналъ тебя втых, но помиловалъ мя еси и сяятъ мя крещений просвятила мя еси. И познахъ тя, боже втых, сяятъ творе во святъ твари, отце господа нашего Исуса Христа. Слава ти [c] сыномъ и сяятъмя.

21 ‘И все страны вняху еси, и дары принишаху еси’ (Zimin, ‘Pamiat’, p.70).
22 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’, p71. Vladimir’s victories in the Pamiat’ i pokhvala are recorded as follows, ‘идущи идущи, владыка: Радимичи пеяды и даны на ныу памяки, Еллинъ пеяды и даны на ныу памяки, Еллинъ пеяды и даны на ныу памяки на обиных, и втленины втл, и природы братьи пеяды и на Казыры цыда, пеяды я и даны на ныу памяки’ (Zimin, ‘Pamiat’, p.71). Accuracy and chronology are not notable features of this list. The Povest’ vremennykh let records Vladimir’s engagements between the years 981-985 (prior to his baptism) with the Viatichi, the Iatvingians, the Radimichi and the Volga Bulgars. The Khazars had already been defeated by Vladimir’s father.
23 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’, p.71
Like the earlier prayer spoken by Vladimir after his baptism, the emphasis falls on the radical transformation he has undergone. As well as reiterating the change that has happened, Vladimir underlines his present knowledge of God, 'нынě же тя знаю и вида'. The key to his transformation is seen as God's mercy and the illumination he received through baptism. A number of phrases echo his earlier prayer. For example, his praise of the Trinity recalls his previous cry, 'и познах тя, вся твои твори. Слава ти, боже всех, отче господа бога нашего Исуса Христа! Слава ти с сыном и святым духом'. The new element in the prayer is the petition that if he is to be punished for his sins, he should not be handed over to demons, but punished by God himself. On this score the narrative reassures the reader that God's angels receive his soul, 'и сине глаголе и молеся богу, преда душю свою съ миромъ ангеломъ господнимъ'.

Thus in his prayers Vladimir looks back to baptism as the turning point in his life. The writer's confidence that Vladimir's soul is received by the angels vindicates his integrity since his baptism. Chronologically the account then reverts to Vladimir's lifetime. Continuity is maintained in the way that Vladimir's baptism serves as the marker by which other events are recorded, 'Нак другое лето по крещеньи к порогомъ ходи, на третье Корсунь городъ взя...'

Before finishing his work, the writer again underlines the inner transformation following Vladimir's baptism, 'кашашься и плачаешься владыки князь Владимиръ всего того, саме створи в поселянствѣ, не знаю бога. Познах же бога истинаго, творца небес и земли, показывающе всего... послужи богу

24 Zimin, 'Pamiat', pp.71-2
25 Zimin, 'Pamiat', p.72
26 Zimin, 'Pamiat', p.72
Here the writer uses similar phrases to describe Vladimir’s change of heart as found in the two longer prayers. From having lived as a pagan and not known God, he evidently comes to know God. Good deeds and almsgiving are seen to follow as a result of Vladimir’s changed life. Surely Vladimir’s good deeds combined with his death as a righteous man are the proof of which the writer spoke earlier? By isolating Vladimir’s baptism primarily as a spiritual event and omitting historical details of where, when and by whom, baptism is placed outside the human world of causality and sequence. Set in the context of inner change, Vladimir’s baptism is shown to be accompanied by repentance as witnessed by the two prayers of penitence inserted after his baptism and before his death. This perspective redresses the danger noted in the first part of *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* that the act of baptism is seen to be sufficient in itself, unrelated to inner change. Vladimir’s military triumphs, including the capture of Kherson, far from being incompatible with good deeds are viewed rather as emanating from them. This approach is particularly suited to a work designed to establish Vladimir’s personal sanctity, elaborating on the eulogistic angle of the first part of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala*, and also sidestepping the murkier aspects of political motivation.

A scrutiny of the prayers as outlined above casts light on the difference between the abbreviated version, which omits the two longer prayers, and the third part of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* which incorporates them. Scholars have argued that the version in the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* including both prayers, represents a form closer to the original work, viewing the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* as a whole. It does appear that the prayers contribute to the portrayal of Vladimir’s sanctity, revealing his inner...

---

27 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’, p.72
repentance as the wellspring of his good deeds and conquests. The similarity of both prayers, however, combined with a disjointed narrative style, cast doubt over whether they formed an integral part of the original compilation, whatever shape that may have taken.

In the Povest' vremennykh let Vladimir’s baptism is depicted in its international setting with less emphasis on his personal desire and goodness. While Vladimir still occupies centre stage, the number of other players has increased. One striking difference from the Pamiat' i pokhvala is the fact that in the chronicler’s account Vladimir’s attack on Kherson and his demand for Anna’s hand are set before his baptism. What the Pamiat' i pokhvala communicates by a single sentence - 'крестихся самъ' - in the Povest' vremennykh let is explained by a succession of events culminating in Vladimir’s baptism. Repentance, transformation and a theological perception of baptism do not characterize the events of the Kherson legend which form part of the chronicler’s record. It is not that the chronicler omits these points in the broader plan. First, there is the evidence of Vladimir’s changed lifestyle - instead of building idols he now erects churches, instead of his immoral lifestyle he marries a Christian princess. Second, from a theological standpoint the meaning of baptism is elucidated in the philosopher’s speech and in Vladimir’s confession of faith after he is baptized. In addition the writer quotes Paul’s explanation of baptism: ‘крестихся самъ къ Иисусу Христу въ смерти Его, крестихся и погребемся съ Нимь крещенными въ смерти, да также креста Христова съ нами есть въ воскресениемъ живота нынѣ’ 29. Baptism is once again linked to repentance in the chronicler’s description of the people as divinely chosen, ‘Иже приняли суть крещенныи и покаяныи въ устушенныи греховъ, новии аквав христианствии, изъвлчения Богъ’ 30. This theological perspective is an important foundation for the chronicler to lay in order to foster a correct

29 PVL, col.120
30 PVL, col.121
understanding of Rus’ as a Christian country. Vladimir acts as a representative for Rus’ and therefore it is imperative that the first Christian prince is seen to accept what would be considered the standard Christian teaching of the chronicler’s day. In the Kherson legend, the agency, the place and the timing of Vladimir’s baptism are crucial. He is seen to make his decision not only as an individual coming before God, but as a ruler and representative of his country. Initially Vladimir’s priority is to find a religion which offers a way of life that will suit his people. The decision is made in consultation with his boiars and the emissaries sent to investigate the faiths.

Vladimir’s prayers point to the spiritual nature of events. His first prayer is in the conditional - if he captures Kherson, he promises to be baptized, ‘въпросъ на него, рече: аще се са съществува, и съмъ са кръщих’. Vladimir’s prayers, however, are open to interpretation. Basile argues that Vladimir tests the Christian God as he would a heathen god by working on the principles of the old culture - prediction and reciprocity, rather than those of the new Christian culture. Pritsak construes the prince as a slow-witted pagan who is sly and false, only keeping his word under duress, being persuaded more easily by pomp and ostentatious display than by reasoned argument. Nonetheless, Vladimir’s conditional prayer reflects a thread running through his remarks - a pointer to baptism. After hearing the philosopher’s explanation of the Last Judgement and seeing a visual...

31 PVLL, col.109
32 G.M. Basile, ‘The Christian Prince’, HUS, 12/13, 1988/89, pp.672-88, suggests that before the fall of Kherson Vladimir is implicitly querying whether the Christian God is so weak that he can allow the defeat of a potential devotee. He cites Vladimir’s refusal to be baptized until Anna marries him as a further test, making his final challenge to God as a blind man. Even though a case can be made for a ‘magical’ understanding of Christianity in the Kherson legend, this one portrayal is an insufficient basis from which to argue that a magical understanding characterized the whole of early Rus’. Ilarion’s eulogy in particular reflects a more Christian understanding of Vladimir’s baptism.
33 O. Pritsak, ‘What really happened in 988’ in The Ukrainian Religious Experience, ed. D.J. Goa, Edmonton, 1989, pp.5-19, remarks that Vladimir needs the superiority of the Christian faith drummed into him several times so that he is forced to keep his promise. He further comments that such a primitive ruler could not have appreciated Christian values by himself but had to be tutored by the Greeks of the Kherson colony.
illustration, Vladimir sighs, 'даммо симъ в десянна, гофе же симъ в шлюва'. To the philosopher's challenge, 'ще хощеш десинъ съ праведными стати, то крестика', Vladimir desists with the remark 'пожау и еще мама'. After Vladimir's emissaries return enthusing about the beauty of the Greek liturgy, he poses the question 'нимым [variant гал] крещение принимем?'. While his comments and prayers anticipate the circumstances of his baptism, they seem strangely unrelated to issues of repentance and trust. Even when Vladimir captures Kherson, his response is not to ask for baptism but to demand Anna's hand, threatening that if the emperors refuse he will sack Constantinople. The emperors agree to his suit on the single condition that he be baptized. They add that baptism would not only secure Anna as his bride, but also the heavenly kingdom and he would be like them, a believer. Vladimir's baptism, as well as resulting in military victory, is seen to win for him, and by extension for Rus', an equal standing with Byzantium. Thus baptism and marriage are perceived as integral to the founding of Rus' as a Christian country. Vladimir promises the Emperors that he will be baptized, pointing out that he has already examined their faith. When Anna and her entourage arrive, Vladimir still delays being baptized but this time, according to God's design (по Божье же встри) so the chronicler reports, he loses his sight. Anna sends Vladimir a message urging him to be baptized at once since this will be his only cure, 'ще хощешь имбят ти божди сена, то вскорѣ крестика, аще ли то не имаши имбят [недуга] сего'. If he is cured, Vladimir gives his word that he will recognize this as evidence of the greatness of the Christian God, 'аа аще истина будет, то пыстия великъ Богъ будет христиска'. Finally he gives the order that they should baptize him. The service is performed by the Bishop of Kherson and the princess'
priests from Constantinople. As the Bishop lays hands on Vladimir, he is healed instantly and his sight is restored. He praises God, saying "τοπηρόν
ναζιότητα Εσώ σε τισινηλάρο". In this version of Vladimir's baptism, the responses and prayers are vital in retaining the focus on baptism and on the divinely ordered events. Otherwise the Kherson legend risks being no more than a tale of war, politics and marriage.

The fact that Vladimir is baptized in the town he has just conquered and by its bishop indicates that his baptism is orthodox and is conducted in an appropriate setting, while avoiding any hint of subservience to Constantinople. On the contrary, the emperors seem cowed by Vladimir's threat of attack, offering Anna's hand in marriage. This circumstance contrasts with the lack of details concerning the whereabouts of Vladimir's baptism in either Ilarion's eulogy or in the Pamiat' i pokhvala. Relations with Constantinople are seen, perhaps in too rosy a light in the Pamiat' i pokhvala, uncomplicated by Vladimir's threats or the emperors' reluctance to surrender Anna. Why the Kherson legend was widely accepted as the standard account has been debated. Likhachev rightly rejects the view held by Shakhmatov and Priselkov that the Kherson legend is a Greek pamphlet. On the contrary, the display of Vladimir's military prowess presents Rus' as an independent power.

On one level the repeated references to baptism create a mood of expectancy, magnifying the moment which has been anticipated by so many other events. Prior to Vladimir's baptism, the Christian God and religion is

---

39 PVLL, col.111
40 Likhachev proposes that the events leading to and including the baptism of Rus' were part of a single work written during the reign of Iaroslav I, which he calls 'Skazanie o rasprostranenii khristianstva na Rusi'. While agreeing that the 'tale' shows signs of unity and cohesiveness, Poppe's refutes the view that such a tale existed in Iaroslav's reign. Among other factors, he comments on the anachronism of the Latin faith which is key to the story of the choice of faiths. While Likhachev maintains that the ecclesiastical angle predominates in the so-called 'Skazanie o rasprostranenii khristianstva na Rusi', it is notable that in the Kherson legend military considerations at times threaten to overshadow the spiritual nature of events. See D.S. Likhachev, Izbrannye raboty, II, (Velikoe nasledie), 1987, pp.83-108 and A. Poppe, 'Two concepts of the conversion of Rus' in Kievan writings', HUS, 12/13, 1988/89, p.495.
shown to be true in its doctrine, beautiful in its use of the Greek liturgy, effective in military affairs, guardian of the imperial Byzantine house and finally miraculous in healing through baptism. Perhaps this complex of incentives reflects more accurately what baptism meant for Rus’ as a nation rather than for Vladimir as an individual. On another level, compared with Vladimir’s longing and eagerness for baptism portrayed in Ilarion’s eulogy and the Pamiat’ i pokhvala, here he appears reluctant and lacking in initiative. Both the increased number of people involved and the prolonged time-scale weaken the portrait of Vladimir, as does his delay in being baptized. Lacking the penitential prayers of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala or Ilarion’s concise explanation, Vladimir’s attitude before baptism as depicted in the chronicle could hardly be described as penitent. Even the moment of baptism is perceived differently. While Ilarion’s eulogy explains baptism primarily in theological terms, and in the Pamiat’ i pokhvala prayers describe the illumination and change brought about by baptism, in the Povest’ vremennykh let Vladimir’s baptism is witnessed foremost as an observed event - the recovery of his sight. Although such a miraculous healing from physical blindness presents the outward corollary to the inner illumination of baptism, Ilarion’s wonder at the miracle of Vladimir’s faith, which has arisen independently of any miracles he saw, is here absent. The essence of Ilarion’s argument is reversed in the Kherson legend, for, on the basis of what Vladimir finally saw, he believed.

After Vladimir’s baptism in Kherson, according to the chronicler he returns to Kiev and orders the people to assemble on the following day to be baptized or consider him their enemy. Judging by this account, how would the people of Kiev have perceived baptism? First, baptism was an order from their prince with the threat of his displeasure if they disobeyed. Second, they may have known about baptism from the Christian community already based in Kiev. The chronicler describes how a multitude of Kievans entered the waters of the Dnieper, the younger ones close to the riverbank,
some standing with children in their arms and others wading out neck deep. Although they evidently lacked Christian teaching and the grander setting of a church with a baptismal font, they must have been struck by the way that this act united all the people regardless of age or social standing. The mass baptism is savoured as the moment of triumph by the chronicler, when the devil finally acknowledges and laments his defeat. This brings full circle his earlier boast that Rus’ was his dwelling, since the apostles had not taught there and the people were bound in idolatrous delusion. He is outraged by the fact that he is vanquished not by the apostles and martyrs, but by an ignoramus - Vladimir. Vladimir steps forward in his new capacity - baptizer and intercessor for the people of Rus’. After the people have gone home, Vladimir looks up to heaven and prays:

Χριστε Βοже, στορυμων οιεο ι εξαλο, πριαζι εον ιεον λαδη ολα κα ι ιαδκ

This prayer explains the significance of the mass baptism to the readers of the chronicle. The people of Rus’ are seen to be now like other Christian countries who know God and whose ruler is regarded as the defender of the Christian faith. Here Vladimir is shown to fight a spiritual battle with a greater enemy.

Other works devoted to the story of Vladimir’s baptism depend on the three main texts already analyzed. For example, the prolog (synaxarion) accounts of Vladimir are based primarily on the Kherson legend.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{41}\) *PVLL, col.118*

\(^{42}\) For theories on the relation between these various prolog accounts and the time of composition see inter alia: N. Nikol’skii, *Materialy dlia povremennogo spiska russikh pisatelei i ikh sochinenii (X-XII vv.)*, St Petersburg, 1906, pp.239-53 and Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, pp.7-13. N. Serebrianskii, *Drevne-russkii kniazheskii zhitiia*, Moscow, 1915, pp.51-73, suggests that the short prolog life was the literary prototype on which subsequent accounts were based, first composed when Vladimir’s feastday was established (the earliest manuscript of the short prolog life dates from the thirteenth century).
Variations in the texts of these accounts highlight some of the problems which beset the chronicler’s rendering of the legend. For example, Vladimir’s delay in being baptized is mitigated by interjecting or altering brief prayers and responses which highlight his sincerity.

In the Zhitiye blazhenogo Volodimira when the prince hears the Greek service described as heaven on earth and the approving murmurs of his boiars, he responds with the words of the well-known prayer, ‘БОЯЗ ГОСПОДНЯ АСТЬ ЕЯЩЕ’, resolving inwardly, ‘СИЦЕ СТРОФЕ’. One of the shorter prolog accounts christianizes Vladimir’s motives for attacking Kherson and shows him at his most decisive. Once he realizes that the Greek faith is like a lamp on a lampstand, he says to himself: ‘СИЦЕ СТРОФЕ, ПИЯДИ В ЗЕМЛЮ И ПАСЕ ЦЕ ЦАДА ИХА, И УЧЕНИЮ ПУЧИТЕЛА. АСЬ МИ ЧИСЛЯН, ТО СТРОФЕ’. In what Sobolevskii calls the normal vita of St Vladimir, the tone of the prince’s prayer, uttered before the final surrender of Kherson, is made more respectful by including additional titles in his address to God: ‘ГОСПОДИ БОЖЕ СИЛА, БЫШЕЙ! АСЬ МИ ССЕЯТЕСТЯ, ТО АСЬ КРУЖУЯ’. In the shorter prolog account when Anna urges Vladimir to be baptized, the conditional remark recorded in the Povest’ vremennykh let: ‘АСЬ АСЬ ИСТИНА ЕЯЩЕ, ТО ПИСТИНЬ БЕЛИКЪ БОГЪ ЕЯЩЕ ХРИСТИАНСКѢ’ is supplanted by his reply, ‘КРЕСТИТЕ МѢ, ИНѢ НА ТѢ КЫ ЕСТЬ ПРИКАЗАЛ’. This lessens the impression that Vladimir is putting the Christian God on trial or that he is looking for a quick cure.

Some accounts elaborate on baptism as a miracle. Whereas the narrative of the Povest’ vremennykh let records the event simply as ‘ИКО

43 Zimin, ‘Pamiat’, p.73
44 Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.28
45 Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.25
46 Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.28
47 In a late sixteenth to early seventeenth-century vita, which Sobolevskii calls the South Russian vita, Anna underlines that baptism will release Vladimir not only from physical but also spiritual blindness. As soon as Vladimir enters the baptismal font he sees as if the scales have fallen from his eyes, a detail which echoes St Paul’s conversion ‘ПОСЛА ЛЮКА УБ. ЕНѢ ЕГѢ ЧИЛА’ (Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.40).
in the shorter prolog account the writer draws attention to the miracle and the moment of baptism which gives Vladimir sight, ‘твь бысть преви ходатан нашему спасини’.^48 One striking omission characterizes the prayer of intercession in the prolog accounts, the absence of the phrase ‘like other Christian countries’. By the time the prolog lives of Vladimir were being compiled (after his canonization sometime in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century), Rus’ was confident of its identity as a Christian country and no longer looked for models to other countries. Instead, Vladimir simply asks God to look down on these ‘newly baptised’ or ‘newly enlightened’ people, that they may know the true God.^51 Another alteration is Vladimir’s petition that God help him against his enemies.^52 This suggests literal enemies, diluting the image of the Povest' vremennych let where Vladimir is presented as victor over his invisible foe as well as his visible enemies.

Apart from the tendency to ‘christianize’ the story of Vladimir’s conversion and baptism, there is a tendency in other works to ‘dechristianize’ it. Notably the so-called Pliginskii miscellany, a work

---

48 PVLL, col.111
49 Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.28
50 Serebrianskii, Kniazheskiiia zhitiia, in what he terms the short prolog redaction, p.15
51 ‘Преди с бысть на ннвркунных люди свит и дали же изъ помнать Тек, истинакого Бага’ (the so-called normal vita in Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.27). ‘Цъка нкность, предъ, Господа, на ннвкунных люди; дали же изъ, Господа, ублажи Тек, истинакого Господа и Бага’ (the so-called expanded prolog account in Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.31).
52 ‘Мне памяни, Господа, на претечи быти’ (the so-called expanded prolog account, Sobolevskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, p.31). Vladimir is also seen to enter the Church of the Tithe after it has been completed, and there prays for the ‘new people’ who he likens to a vine, asking God to hear the prayers offered to him in the church.
which Shakhmatov mistakenly considered to be an earlier version of the Kherson legend, ‘dechristianizes’ the tale.\textsuperscript{53} The story of Vladimir’s baptism becomes more racy and violent. To add to his bevy of twelve wives and eight hundred concubines, Vladimir sends Oleg to fetch the prince of Kherson’s daughter. The prince’s mocking refusal incenses Vladimir who attacks Kherson with the help of native Zhedben. Once he has overcome the town, he assaults the princess in front of her parents, whom he then murders, sending his men to Constantinople to ask for Anna’s hand. The Emperors agree on condition he is baptized. At first Vladimir’s response is promising and he says ‘Боги хлещут Ахию, мя чистыя крещеница’.\textsuperscript{54} The emperors in tears take Anna, the patriarchs and the whole company into the church and pray that she will not be defiled by this pagan. Retracting his earlier promise, Vladimir is blinded and covered with sores directly as a result of his dishonourable intentions toward Anna. Three times he is immersed in the baptismal font before his sores fall away like fish scales. Vladimir orders the baptism of his soldiers and then returns to Kiev. Back home he orders the city to be baptized on pain of death.

In this reinterpretation of the Kherson legend the writer does not try to modify the impression of Vladimir as a grasping and violent man with brief prayers and responses, but on the contrary accentuates these qualities. His one pious remark about his longing for baptism is seen to be insincere when he plans to go back on his word. The Emperors initially appear more helpless and terrified by Vladimir’s threat than in the \textit{Povest' vremennykh let} account, but it is their prayer rather than the prince’s virtue which prevails. Vladimir’s blindness, now accompanied by sores, is seen as a direct result of his intention to break faith with Anna. Even after his baptism and healing, the predominant image is of tyrant rather than a penitent

\textsuperscript{53} Shakhmatov, ‘Korsunskaiia legenda’, pp.1029-1153, argues that this version derives from one of the earliest stories about Vladimir, originating from an early redaction of a legendary \textit{vita} already circulating in the eleventh century. For arguments refuting this view see Serebrianskii, \textit{Kniazheskiiia zhitiia}, p.71.

\textsuperscript{54} Shakhmatov, ‘Korsunskaiia legenda’, p.1075
sinner. In many ways the *Pliginskii miscellany* is a travesty of the Kherson legend, exposing weaknesses in the account of Vladimir’s baptism as a Christian story, particularly the way Vladimir’s motivation is tarnished with political concerns while repentance is hardly mentioned.

As the first prince of Rus’ to be baptized, it was important to set a precedent which could be followed not just during his lifetime, but for centuries to come. Writers who documented Vladimir’s baptism had a demanding job. Together with disagreement over the barest facts, they also faced a problem of interpretation. From the kaleidoscope of images cast of his conversion and baptism in their accounts, the perception of Vladimir as a sincere and penitent saint jostles with Vladimir as a ruthless and immoral sinner.

A successful blend of factors was hard to achieve. Prayers helped to elucidate the spiritual side of events, most notably of Vladimir’s baptism. In the third part of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* the two longer prayers describe Vladimir’s baptism primarily in terms of a spiritual event, omitting details of where and when. Both prayers are said at important junctures of the prince’s life, one after baptism and the other before death. They portray baptism as the turning-point of his life and as the moment of illumination. Through his prayers Vladimir gains a platform from which to express sentiments appropriate to a new convert - his repentance, his inner transformation and his joy in God. The emphasis on inner goodness reinforces the writer’s opening message that the proof of a man’s righteousness lies in his good deeds rather than his miracles. The second penitent prayer illustrates the prince’s continued repentance, guaranteeing his place among the righteous, since the reader is assured that his soul is taken by angels, not demons. Vladimir’s military victories, the capture of Kherson and his marriage to Anna are perceived as springing from his good deeds and latterly from his desire to christianize Rus’. Thus prayers in the third part of the *Pamiat’ i pokhvala* help to portray Vladimir as a man
whose conversion, baptism and subsequent good deeds destine him for a place among the righteous after his death, speaking more eloquently for his sanctity than miracles. Military success and glory are not abandoned in such a depiction of Vladimir’s inner qualities and good deeds, rather they emanate from them. Thus Vladimir was portrayed as a bona fide saint while the image of Rus’ as a powerful nation, far from being undermined by conversion, was in fact enhanced.

By contrast the Kherson legend in the Povest’ vremennykh let focusses on the build-up of events culminating in Vladimir’s baptism which takes place in Kherson. To balance the momentum of external events which sweep Vladimir to his conversion, the writer inserts responses in the form of prayers and comments. Although these prayers help to dispel the impression of Vladimir as a reluctant and self-seeking convert, they do not entirely recast this image. Indeed, even the prayers can be perceived as those of a man bargaining with the deity and demanding visual proof, still a far cry from the picture of a penitent sinner. Apparent unease with the Kherson legend is illustrated in the way the prolog accounts modify Vladimir’s portrait by adding or altering short prayers and remarks. These are designed to make him more decisive and godly. By contrast, in the Pliginskii miscellany, Vladimir’s one promising response turns to dust and the story becomes a tale of adventure.

Vladimir’s baptism is crowned in the Kherson legend by a miracle of healing. It is this miracle, rather than repentance, which is seen as the final step. While Vladimir’s miraculous healing makes his baptism more spectacular and observable, it also detracts from the perception expressed in Ilarion’s Slovo o zakone i blagodati that the miracle consists foremost in Vladimir’s faith. The chronicler shows more distress about the lack of posthumous miracles than either Ilarion or the writer of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala whose admiration is reserved for Vladimir’s faith and also for his transformed life and good deeds.
The baptism of the Kievan population, famously recorded as 988 in the Povest' vremennykh let, was one of the obvious landmarks in the evolving perception of Rus'. But the question remains as to how baptism was perceived. In the first part of the Pamiat' i pokhvala baptism assumes a significance in its own right as a national act and as a marvellous deed for which Vladimir personally was responsible. The possibility of resistance and the process of understanding the Christian faith are not considered. If, as Ilarion and the chronicler report, Vladimir ordered the people to be baptized, then the external rite would not necessarily have been given meaning by the new converts' faith and repentance. The chronicler, probably aware that in this case baptism could be conceived as a mark of Vladimir's power rather than of true faith, corrected this impression by describing the people's willingness to accept baptism. Willingness to follow Vladimir's example, however, still did not equal understanding. In the two penitential prayers of the third part of the Pamiat' i pokhvala Vladimir describes himself as illuminated by baptism, so that understanding is seen to be given at baptism. This perception is a conventional one but it leaves unresolved the question of what happened to the people of Kiev who neither understood nor desired the Christian faith and yet were baptized. Only Ilarion seems to distinguish between the illumining of the mind prior to baptism and baptism itself. Central to the initial baptism of the Kievan population was the prince and the weight of his command. It would thus appear that at the outset the lines between politics, faith and power were not clearly drawn in Rus'.

55 'Не еш ли съдимого ж протившчало благочестивых егоже правления, да аще кто и не любове, якъ страхом прошедшия прежашь, понима въ благовести ого святство соображенъ' (Moldovan, Slovo, p.93, fol.186v).

56 The chronicler also reports that Vladimir's command to the Kievan population to be baptized contained a threat, but then comments how they accepted his decision gladly. 'Послѣ же Владимиров гласъ съ велю граду, глагола: аще не ишадаетесь кто изъ васъ въ вѣру, ешьтъ ли экъ ешьтъ, или неешь ли яродись, противыни мигдя ешьтъ. Се овтошенье, люди съ радостью приидоху' (PVII, col.117).
After the people are baptized in the Dnieper, the chronicler puts into Vladimir’s mouth a prayer of intercession for the nation of Rus’. His prayer identifies Rus’ as one of the Christian countries, with himself in the role of warrior against evil. Although Vladimir is depicted as the baptizer and apostle of Rus’, in practice he could only hope to make a beginning. Converting the people’s minds and way of life was an ongoing process. Nevertheless, in creating a national identity, writers naturally preferred the legend of one man, Vladimir, to the complexity of a process which took decades, recognition of which could have undermined the buoyant confidence of Rus’ as a Christian nation.

While the baptism of Vladimir was clearly of enormous significance in the life of Rus’, shifting patterns in the depiction of his conversion suggest that the picture was far from clearcut. The portrayal of Vladimir’s baptism in Ilarion’s eulogy and the third part of Pamiat’ i pokhvala, concentrate on his personal sanctity and underline his faith and inner transformation. By contrast in the Povest’ vremennykh let baptism is perceived primarily through outward events, most apparent in the miracle of healing. While recognizing that each work has a unique character, the search for external expressions of faith reflects the tendency of later editors of the Povest’ vremennykh let to make the links between Rus’ and the apostles more concrete. Thus St Andrew and St Andronicus are heralded as the first apostles and teachers to set foot on Slav soil. In any attempt to define national identity, faith and inner transformation are always harder to communicate than tangible precedents and events. Prayers, in the form of brief petitions set within a narrative, or as longer self-contained works, reflect the attempt to bring to the fore the religious aspect of Vladimir’s baptism, potentially lost in the welter of events, thus smoothing the way for his veneration and providing a commendable example for the nation of Rus’.
The prayers attributed to St Boris and St Gleb

At first glance it seems paradoxical that Vladimir I’s two younger sons, whose premature death denied them the opportunity to make their mark in politics or war, should become potent symbols of national life. At the time of Vladimir’s baptism around 988 he was sole ruler of Rus’, but by his death in 1015 more than ten of his sons were ruling princes in Rus’, all presumably baptized. The threat of war was now no longer so much from without as from within. Against this background Boris and Gleb’s death offered a fresh and timely perspective on nationhood and spirituality. First, their martyrdom could be perceived as the next step for Rus’ as an emerging Christian nation - the land of Rus’ is seen to be washed by the blood of martyrs thereby becoming a terra sancta. Second, their martyrdom was a national example of brotherly love, in short supply among the ruling family of princes. Undoubtedly by the time of Vladimir I’s great-grandson, Vladimir Monomakh, when the ruling dynasty had further multiplied and factionalized, veneration of the two brothers offered the ruling clan divine sanction and prestige, as well as a focus of unity. Posthumous miracles reported by commoner and prince alike also confirmed their sanctity and national standing. On what grounds they were given the title of martyrs, however, is still a moot point.

Prayers and additional forms of commentary are key in presenting Boris and Gleb as martyrs rather than as victims of political assassination in the three main accounts (the entry s.a.1015 in the Povest’ vremennykh let, Nestor’s Chtenie, and the Skazanie).\(^1\) Contrary to previous claims that Boris

---

\(^1\) For the texts of the Chtenie and the Skazanie I shall be using D. Abramovich’s edition, Zhitiia sviatykh muchenikov Borisa i Gleba i sluzhby im, Petrograd, 1916. Repr. L. Müller (ed.), Die
and Gleb's martyrdom is justified on the grounds of nonresistance and sacrifice alone.\(^2\) A closer scrutiny of the prayers reveals that the Chtenie and the Skazanie present a more complex picture of their martyrdom, which also comments on the perception of the prince in Rus'. While focusing on the prayers attributed to the martyrs, it should be remembered that in the eyes of the writers, the story's ending - Jaroslav's efficient victory, Boris and Gleb's joyful reunion in heaven, and Sviatopolk's grisly death - would have vindicated their behaviour.

In order to identify the elements of Boris and Gleb's martyrdom which can be seen as conventional, passing reference will be made to martyriological tradition. The prolific number of Byzantine martyrria and the reports of earlier martyrdoms differ in at least one fundamental way - their martyrs die for defending Christian faith before pagans, while Boris and Gleb are martyred in a Christian country. Prayers are often an important element in traditional martyrria. During prolonged tortures the hero generally asks God to perform miracles or to avenge him or her, prayers

---

which are answered in a spectacular way. Once the saint refuses to recant or to sacrifice to pagan gods, they are sentenced. This provides a natural podium from which to speak and pray.

The entry s.a.1015 of the *Povest' vremennykh let* portrays Boris on the morning of his death singing from the Psalter and praying. A closer examination of these verses and prayer, points to certain elements of martyrdom which are highlighted. Firstly, the material appears to be motivated by the drama of events. Boris knows his murderer are closing in on him before he starts to sing the Orthros. When he catches sight of them his words from the Psalter are lent greater poignancy. Secondly, contrary to Freydank’s opinion that the excerpts from Psalter are of no particular significance, I would argue that they serve to highlight opposition and Christ-like suffering. The first three quotations are taken from the beginning of the first, second and sixth psalm of the ‘six psalms’ sung at the beginning of the Orthros:

\[ \text{Господи, что са гъмножиша стужающи мнѣ, мнѣси вѣстаютъ на мѣ}, \text{и пакѣ, 'иако стрѣлы твоя гъмножиша во мнѣ, иако дубъ на рѣнѣ готовъ, и блажень мѣна предо мню есть'. И пакѣ глаголаше: 'Господи, скудани} \]

3 When Nicetas is strung between two pillars and his body is about to be sawn through, he prays to God, saying, 'I thank you, my Lord'. Having prayed thus, his body is unharmed and the sword becomes like wax (V. Istrin (ed.), *Apokrificheskoe muchenie Nikity*, Odessa, 1898, p.80).

4 Rather than the drawn-out tortures and the damning trial endured by some martyrs Boris’ persecution in the *Povest’ vremennykh let* occurs on the morning of his murder. As martyrdom continued to evolve after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire, greater tortures and miracles were introduced into the accounts. K. Holl, ‘Die Vorstellung vom Märtyrer und die Märtyrerekte in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung’, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik*, 33, 1914, pp.521-56, draws attention to the Greek term ‘megalomartus’ which was used to describe ‘super-martyrs’ such as St Demetrius and St Barbara who were noted for prodigious suffering and miracles. In the martyrion of St Irene her father orders that she be thrown into a deep pit full of vipers. Irene, however, takes the initiative and jumps in, remains unharmed (*Usp mise*, pp. 147-8).

5 Additional pathos is lent to princes and martyrs who die during or after performing a pious office. Ingham cites several examples of last-hour praying and attendance at mass in accounts of European princes and kings who are martyred. See N. Ingham, ‘The sovereign as martyr, East and West’, *Slavonic East European Journal*, 17, 1973, 1, pp.1-17.

6 In the so-called First Slavonic Life of Wenceslas, Wenceslas hears the bell for the Orthros and says, ‘слава твей, Господи, ибо душа моя необходима твей силы’. Events of that morning heighten the pathos of an exclamation of praise that might otherwise sound ordinary (F. Mareš, *An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin*, (Slavische Propyläen 127), Munich, 1979, p.107).
Three aspects of Boris' persecution are brought to the fore by the quotations from the three psalms. First, the sense that he is outnumbered by oppressors, second, wounding and pain, and third, his imminent meeting with God. In the second quotation the selected phrases accentuate the theme of physical suffering. The image of being pierced by arrows (якo стрвлы твoя гньздыша во мнe) is joined to a verse which occurs fifteen verses later in psalm thirty seven, portraying the psalmist as he contemplates possible wounding and illness (якo λαύ χα ράνες γοητευ, και ήλεώςμα κα πρώ χ απο μένα εστι). After singing the 'six psalms', Boris quotes another portion of the Psalter which comes in the middle of the service, 'якo θεία δείβα μα φθίζει τού θείν και σβορε δαρμήνωχ σφέτε θα. Γοσπολιν Βοσ θεί, α ε τα πησέωκ και σπάς μα και ωτ κεφάλη γνωσίκ [μα], ιοσακι μα'. Müller points out that the quotation from the Psalter juxtaposes different verses from psalms twenty-one and seven, two psalms which never combine in the Orthros. For Boris, reference to strong bulls and an encircling band of evildoers is pertinent, for he now sees his assassins literally surrounding him. The quotation from psalm twenty-one echoes Christ's sufferings, and since the time of the Gospel writers it has been interpreted as a passion psalm, predicting the sufferings of Christ. 

Despite a superficial concern to present the liturgical order of the Orthros, it emerges that the writer's over-riding purpose is to select appropriate excerpts from the Psalter which intensify the drama of Boris' death and his suffering.

7 PVL, col.133. The 'six psalms' comprise psalms 3, 37, 62, 87, 102 and 142.
8 John quotes the same passage when he depicts the soldiers casting lots for Jesus' clothing: 'This was to fulfil the scripture, "They parted my garments among them, and for my clothing they cast lots"' (John 19:24).
9 St Irene also quotes from psalm twenty-one: 'θεία δείβα μα πλούς μικρής και φθίζει τού θείν και δαρκίθα μα. Θείας κρατήρις θείας έθανέτας έτοι και φοίνωχ σφέτε μεθ έγνωτα μια' (Usp misc, p.150). Here the writer does not exploit the quotation as a dramatic device to depict physical encirclement, but rather uses it to describe the hypocrites which oppress her.
Boris’ final prayer in the chronicler’s account is addressed to Christ and uttered while he is still in his tent, looking at an icon of Christ. In martyria martyrs will often address their final prayer to Christ, affirming their faith and demonstrating their great courage before a number of witnesses. Boris may not be surrounded by a multitude of witnesses like other martyrs, but his last prayer serves to reinforce the theme of imitatio Christi:

Господи Иисус Христе, иже сим образом явился на земли спасенья ради нашего, исповедай свою волю приготовить на крестъ руце свои, и приняя страсть греха ради наших, тако и мене сподоби принати страсть, се же не ст противныхъ приниманъ, но ст брата своего, и не створи намъ Господи к сему греха.

In this prayer Boris underlines the voluntary nature of Christ’s passion (исповедай свою волю), a quality which implicitly characterizes his own suffering. The central petition of the prayer is that he will be made worthy to accept suffering (мне сподоби принати страстъ), just as Christ accepted his suffering (приняя страстъ). The single word ‘страстъ’ is particularly evocative of Christ’s passion, thereby strengthening the identity between Christ and Boris, a link also underscored in the early martyria where the martyr is seen to experience something of Christ’s sufferings as well as being aware of Christ’s participation in their sufferings. By referring to his brother’s treachery, Boris’ prayer points to the particular circumstances of his martyrdom, to which he responds with words of forgiveness in the manner of Stephen the Martyr. Having finished his prayer, Boris lies down in a defenceless position at which point his killers fall on him like wild animals.

---

10 K. Baus comments on the Christocentric nature of the martyrs’ prayers. From approximately fifty reports of martyrs’ deaths, he records that fifty-six prayers attributed to them as they face death are addressed to Christ, and eight to God the Father. See K. Baus, ‘Das Gebet der Märtyrer’, Trierer theologische Zeitschrift, 62, 1953, (hereafter Baus, ‘Das Gebet’), p.29.

11 PLL, col.133

12 Baus refers to it as ‘die Passionsmystik’ and cites a number of examples (‘Das Gebet’, p.29).
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In this he is seen to show a Christ-like willingness to surrender himself to his passion.

Gleb is cast in a different role. In all three accounts he is pictured as younger than Boris, an imitator of his brother rather than a leader. His martyrdom is conceived primarily in terms of sacrifice. Sviatopolk has less reason to murder Gleb than Boris, since Gleb appears to offer no threat to him and therefore this second murder is seen as more terrible. In the *Povest’ vremennykh let* circumstances play a decisive role in shaping Gleb’s martyrdom. Unlike Boris, Gleb is ill-prepared either to resist his murderers or to face his martyrdom. All he has at his disposal are a small retinue, a lame horse and a boat. He does not have the leisure of the Orthros or Vespers before the murderers are upon him. Instead, Gleb’s prayer is spoken in response to hearing the news of two family deaths and the plot against his own life. In his prayer he mourns the loss of his father but especially of Boris:

Although Gleb’s first cry is directed to God, the rest of his prayer is spoken to Boris in a manner reminiscent of ancestral prayer. Only the chronicler’s insistence that Gleb’s outburst is a prayer (noted before and after - нач. молитва съ слезами глагола... и сице ему малашюса съ слезами), makes its status clear. In other respects the prayer is closer to a lament, expressing Gleb’s longing to be reunited with his brother in death rather than a desire for

---

13 PVL, col.136
martyrdom. In one evocative phrase Gleb refers to his martyrdom, asking Boris that he might accept the same passion, "я и я же страть принад." By analogy, Gleb takes on Boris’ identity as a martyr. Unlike most martyrs, Gleb dies in silence without uttering a final prayer. The narrator makes up for this silence by describing how Gleb is slain like a blameless lamb, a fragrant and sensible sacrifice to God, "да ангел непорочна, принесся на жертву Божией в вино благовестянъя, жертва славесная". Gleb’s prayer to Boris is seen to be vindicated by the indescribable joy the chronicler depicts, as he is reunited with his brother. Thus in the Povest’ vremennykh let Gleb’s prayer is primarily addressed to Boris as a lament rather than representing a profession of faith in the face of death and his martyrdom is focussed on one aspect of imitatio Christi - sacrifice.

Since the occasion, format and manner of the prayers contribute significantly to the image of the saints, I shall comment on these aspects in the Chtienie and Skazanie, the two longer and more comprehensive works, before returning to a discussion of the content of prayers.

In the Chtienie Boris and Gleb’s prayers are far less varied in length, style and tone than those of the Skazanie, in keeping with the more schematic and even structuring of the work as a whole. Prayers are clearly marked off in the text, generally beginning with the invocation "Богом", indicative of God’s sovereignty, and closing with the familiar ‘amen’. Petitions often show how God’s attributes match the situation. For example, Gleb describes God as the one who helps when he asks for help. Likewise, having asked God to rescue him, he finishes his prayer by declaring, "яко Ты

14 Adrianova-Peretts identifies the mourner’s longing to be dead and reunited with the loved one as a common folkloric device. In the story in the Povest’ vremennykh let she also singles out the way Gleb addresses Boris as though living, as a characteristic of laments (Ocherki poeticheskogo stila drevnei Rusi, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947, p.135ff.). One should add that laments are also found in Byzantine funeral orations and in Biblical literature.
15 PVL, col.136
16 PVL, col.136
17 "яко Ты еси памятникъ на Тя уповашемъ" (Chtienie, p.8).
Thus the structuring of prayers seems to reflect a control which characterizes the narrative.

Prayers tend to occur at conventional moments in the *Chtenie*. For example, when Boris hears of his father’s death and then of his own impending death, he turns to prayer. As well as marking moments of tragedy and impending death, prayers are distributed more evenly throughout the narrative and from their youth the brothers are depicted as praying to God. The timing of the Orthros is used to illustrate God’s sovereignty, since the killers dare not attack Boris until it ends, ‘не постичи имь Богъ, дни же конца злутрения’.

As well as prayers being expressed in conventional format and at appropriate moments, they are uttered in traditional postures in the *Chtenie*. For example, Gleb, when contemplating flight, finds time to kneel and pray in the middle of the Church of the Theotokos. Boris, though wounded, manages to raise his hands for his final prayer. Overall, Boris and Gleb are depicted more as two equals, both deserving of the title of martyr. Gleb, like Boris also quotes from the Psalter before uttering his last prayer. In this way Nestor points to the priority of the ‘spiritual’ model over the method of analogy, whereby Gleb’s suffering is shown to resemble Boris’ and therefore he is considered a martyr.

The uniformity of prayers in the *Chtenie* has several consequences. It may suggest a constancy of response which is appropriate in view of a sovereign God who is enthroned above circumstances. The opening and closing invocation of God in the prayers can be seen to put human trials into an eternal perspective. Of course, the danger is that such prayers become predictable and dull. By elevating the spiritual model above human affairs, the reader may disengage emotionally from the depiction of the martyrs. In

---

18 *Chtenie*, p.8
19 *Chtenie*, p.11
the setting of the prayers within the narrative the writer appears to prefer a theologically correct outlook.

If the prayers of the *chtienie* lap like the waves of a calm sea, pointing to the eternal rhythm which is seen to order the work, the *Skazanie*, by contrast builds up like a storm in which the waves become breakers at the moment of the saints’ deaths. In the portrayal of Boris’ death the writer combines traditional martyrological elements with pathos and a gradual build up to his final moments. When Boris hears news of his father’s death, his response is depicted in stages, unlike Nestor’s Boris who immediately reacts with pious prayer. Here Boris is at first he is so overcome with sorrow at his father’s death that he is unable to speak. As his distress gives way to reflection, Boris anticipates Sviatopolk’s evil plan and resolves on the basis of several New Testament quotations not to resist but rather to go humbly to his brother. Frequently the saints’ mental dialogue is indicated by phrases such as ‘и си на ум си помышляя’ or ‘и глаголаше въ сърдцахь своехъ’. Having finished his reflection, Boris utters a short prayer that God’s will be done. This prayer is marked primarily by the fact that Boris now speaks aloud for the first time since hearing of his father’s death. Far from being portrayed as an automatic response, prayer comes at the moment of resolve after Boris has first given rein to the force of emotion and thought. Even once Boris has decided not to resist and prays instead that God’s will be done, the writer presents a more obviously human saint. Boris again reflects, laments and prays, before he is ready to face martyrdom.

Rather than praying in sacred places or poses, Boris’ thoughts and prayers are said in the first instance while he is travelling. Often the writer interjects phrases such as ‘и дышъ жеси путь отд’. As well as depicting physical movement, these interjections add a sense of dynamic to his reflections. Lament rather than prayer is the initial response to the news of death. There is both lament said by others, for example, the unspoken lament by the

---

20 *Skazanie*, p.30
bystanders who witness Boris’ death, as well as laments uttered by the two brothers.\textsuperscript{21} The combination of prayer and lament intertwines an emotional fabric of pathos and victory, two keynotes in his final prayers. Once Boris has disbanded his father’s soldiers, his prayers increase in length and prominence. Unlike the classical martyrs who stare death in the face without quavering, Boris’ inner turmoil is shown by his troubled sleep the night before his death. In other ways, however, the writer of the \textit{Skazanie} observes the traditional patterns of \textit{martyria}. For example, Boris asks to be granted time to pray. Dramatically this motif is less effective at this point in the narrative, since Boris has already sung the Orthros and prayed twice. Even though Boris’ final prayer is spoken in the classical pose looking up to heaven, his humanity is portrayed by the additional reference to his tears and sighing - ‘съ слезами и гоне въ адъ хнырь’.\textsuperscript{22}

The tears of the \textit{Skazanie} have been interpreted as an expression of the gift of tears which accompanies prayer.\textsuperscript{23} It is worth noting, however, that the gift of tears is a grace generally associated with repentance rather than with an individual’s suffering. In addition, the tears may echo the anguished prayer of Christ on the night of his betrayal, a Biblical model sometimes discernible in traditional \textit{martyria}. Furthermore, in the \textit{Skazanie} Boris and Gleb’s tears are only one of several signs of emotion. For example, while praying in his tent Boris feels a mixture of emotions and he is portrayed as weeping with a crushed heart and a joyful soul.\textsuperscript{24} When Boris tells his killers to perform their service, he speaks ‘умиланы душа и

\textsuperscript{21} The lament by the servant and priest reinforces the import of Boris’ prayer as a man who did not want to resist because of his love for Christ, ‘яко не въ сърдце притягнъся любовь ради Христа’ (\textit{Skazanie}, p.35). Presumably a second lament by the bystanders does not include the killers since it is addressed to ‘our dear prince’.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Skazanie}, p.35

\textsuperscript{23} Lilienfeld notes that in the \textit{Skazanie} the face of the saint is often covered with tears, commenting that this is nothing to do with sentimentality, but should be seen as the gift of prayer and tears. See F. von Lilienfeld, ‘Die ältesten russischen Heiligen-legenden. Studien zu den Anfängen der russischen Hagiographie und ihr Verhältnis zum byzantinischen Beispiel’, \textit{Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten}, 5, 1957, (hereafter Lilienfeld, ‘Die ältesten russischen Heiligen-legenden’), p.261.

\textsuperscript{24} ‘Плаканием сърцемъ и душою радость’ (\textit{Skazanie}, p.33).
This emotional colouring diverges from the bold defiance generally exhibited by a martyr. Likewise Gleb's final prayer is pronounced on his knees, thereby intensifying the image of sacrifice. By contrast, in the Chtenie it is his murderer, the cook, who kneels before he kills Gleb. Moreover, both Boris and Gleb in the Skazanie call attention to their grief. Boris implores God in his prayer to behold the pain of his heart, while Gleb pleads with his father to look and see his grief, his inner wound and his tears flowing like a river. The mixture of prayer, lament and reflection and the portrayal of apparently conflicting emotions, make the Skazanie appear to be a drama of emotion.

With an emphasis on elements of pathos, the horizontal relationships between people in the Skazanie at times predominate over the brothers' vertical relationship with God, thereby bringing the princely ruling family to the fore. By contrast, in the Chtenie the format, occasion and posture of the prayers and the tidy parallels inherent in the narrative, contribute to the impression of the divine ordering of human affairs and relationships. The setting of the prayers is seen to provide an illuminating introduction to a discussion of their content.

In the Chtenie prayers are said with God's sovereignty in view. According to hagiographical convention Nestor begins the Chtenie as he does the Zhitiie Feodosiia, with a confession of his own weakness and a prayer for divine help. Behind this conventional plea emerges a significant difference between the two prayers. In the Zhitiie Feodosiia Nestor addresses his prayer to the Lord Jesus, while in the Chtenie Nestor invokes God as sovereign ruler and creator.

---

25 Skazanie, p.36. Before making his pitiful appeal to his killers, Gleb is depicted in highly emotive terms, "uimenymi irmi i sdelani ince oj umyshyi, sakharnymi s duplicates, smeryshchayu razumem i chastnym vozduhannymi, vse sdelani razvivaysya, a televu utryva, zhalyyu glaz sputudal" (p.40-1).

26 Quoted by Boris and Gleb in the Skazanie as 'vika vikii oreda mnogu' (p.36) and 'vika okryel oreda mnogu i zevku duha mne', 'vika techenia oreda mnogu, zhe reku' (p.42) respectively.

27 Lilienfeld imagines the Skazanie in terms of an opera, where the prayers and reflections form the arias which dominate the action (='Die altesten russischen Heiligen-legenden', p.263)
Nestor goes on to explain why the recognition of God as sovereign and creator makes sense not only of Boris and Gleb’s martyrdom, but also of the history of Rus’ and of the world. Beginning at Creation, he gives a potted world history from a Biblical perspective. At the heart of the human condition the writer depicts a spiritual conflict of greater magnitude between God and the devil. Seeing man multiply even after the fall, the devil causes man to worship idols rather than God, who the writer emphasizes is the creator. Rus’ too is depicted as deluded by idol worship. Nestor’s confession of God as creator in his opening prayer thus encapsulates the history of salvation, placing him in the time after the conversion of Rus’.

The seemingly late conversion of Rus’ and its apparent neglect by the apostles, Nestor explains in the broader plan as the working of divine sovereignty. Thus the parable of the vineyard is interpreted as a prophecy, which, he underlines, happened according to God’s timing, ‘но ища благословенный небесный владыка, как прежде покланялся.’ Vladimir’s baptism and also the baptism of Rus’ are viewed as God’s sovereign intervention. Miraculously, the people of Rus’ run joyfully to baptism, as if they had already been instructed in the faith for a long time. From the outset, the prayers are seen to focus on the role of the divine, sovereign ruler rather than the earthly ruling family of Rus’.

The writers of the Skazanie and the Chtenie prepare the brothers for their martyrdom in different ways, reinforced by the use of prayers at key points. In the Chtenie Nestor observes the norm of a vita by sketching in the

---

28 *Chtenie*, p.1
29 ‘Смотря как золотится иладьи, а во Богу, стекшиму небо и жылы’ (*Chtenie*, p.2).
30 God as creator is a recurring refrain in the introduction and Nestor calls the people God’s creation. For example ‘Не ты сии боги пришлед на создани свят, не имяя власти в тяне свои’ (*Chtenie*, p.2). Rus’ is converted when the Lord Jesus looks with kindness on his creation - ‘на свят твят’.
31 *Chtenie*, p.4
32 ‘Тако же и слух Владимиря зледения Божия кать ему кръстъание створи же’ (*Chtenie*, p.4).
saints’ childhood. Upon reading the *vitae* and *martyria* of the saints, Boris prays that he too will follow in the footsteps of the holy ones:

> Владыко мой, Исусе Христе, сподоби меня яко единого отъ тыхъ святыхъ, и даруй ми по стопамъ ихъ ходити. Господи, Боже мой, да не вознесется мысль моя суетою мира сего, но просею сердце мое на разумие твое и твоихъ заповедей, и даруй ми дарвъ его же даровъ отъ вѣка угодниковѣ. Ты еси Царь и Богъ истинный, иже помиловавшись и изведи ны отъ тьмы ко свѣту, Тобѣ всѣ слава вѣкѣ вѣку. Аминѣ.

Here Boris’ displays confidence in God, addressing him as king, ‘Caesar’, a title which at this point in the prayer underlines the authority of the heavenly sovereign. Rather than appear an innocent victim in his death, Boris’ martyrdom is here perceived as an answer to his childhood prayer to be made like the saints and martyrs whom he had read about. Nestor emphasizes the traditional view of martyrdom as a gift, and the verb ‘to give’ resounds in Boris’ prayer, especially in his petition ‘даруй мнѣ дарвъ, его же даровъ отъ вѣка угодниковѣ.’ Gleb too is depicted alongside Boris, emulating his devotion to God, and being obedient to his older brother.

In the *Chtenie* when Boris hears of his father’s death he prays:

> Владыко Господи, Исусе Христе, покойный всѣ святыхъ отца, угоднича Тебѣ, Боже истинный, Ты и нынѣ покой, Господи, душа раба свого, отца моего Василия со сми праведными: св. Абрааму, Исаку, Якову. Яко Ты еси покой, воскресение упокоящему на Тя, и Тебѣ славу кылаемъ вѣкѣ.

This prayer once again reinforces the priority of the spiritual over the earthly. Boris’ first concern is for his father’s spiritual welfare rather than his personal loss. Following the usual pattern of Nestor’s prayers, Boris’ address describes God in such a way that he is seen to be able to meet the current needs. In this instance God is described as the one who gives rest to

---

33 *Chtenie*, p.5
34 *Chtenie*, p.5, n.14. Other variants read ‘tsar’.
35 *Chtenie*, p.8
those who have pleased him, sounding the keynote of the prayer. Rather than emphasize his earthly relation to his father, Boris sets him in a heavenly context among the holy fathers and the company of the righteous with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Just as Gleb in his prayer intercedes first for Boris as God's servant, and only second for his brother, so here Boris calls his father God's servant, before he calls him father.

In the Chtenie Boris is given little opportunity to contemplate his martyrdom because of his reluctance to believe any evil about his brother. Hearing that his elder brother is on the throne, Boris rejoices, responding as a dutiful younger brother should, 'сий ми будеть яко отець'. Twice Boris is told that his brother is plotting to kill him, but still he refuses to believe such reports. On hearing that Gleb has fled, Boris determines neither to flee nor to oppose his elder brother. Instead he stays where he is and spends the night praying and reading in preparation for the following day. By comparison with Boris of the Skazanie, Nestor's Boris has little time to reflect on his martyrdom and his relationships with his family. Even when Boris hears that his assassins are near, his prayer is formulated as a standard cry for deliverance rather than as an expression of his martyrdom:

Владыко Господа, Исус Христе, не остави мне погибнуть, но ты самъ державную руку твою простри на мя грешнаго и худаго, искаки мя отъ ярости идущих на мя, спаси мя въ часъ сий, яко Ты единъ еси пребывшее печальныя, Ты еси Богъ истинный, Тебе слава въ векъ аминь.36

In fact Boris will not be rescued from the hands of his killers. He explains his martyrdom in a speech to his father's men. Rejecting their plan to drive Sviatopolk from Kiev and install him as prince, he says that it is better for one to die than for all of them to face his brother's retribution, 'изъ уми есть мнѣ единому умереть, нежели толику душь'.37 He is seen to echo the prophetic

36 Chtenie, p.10
37 Chtenie, p.10
words spoken by Caiaphas about the death of Jesus.\textsuperscript{38} Boris is also concerned that if he opposes his older brother he may face divine judgement, while if he goes in peace he can be confident of mercy. In this way his martyrdom is explained primarily in terms of his saving concern for others and his proper submission to his older brother.

On the morning of his murder Boris orders the presbyter to sing the Orthros and read the Gospel.\textsuperscript{39} Only one quotation is taken from the beginning of the ‘six psalms’, "Gосподи, и что се умножися стражающие ми? Мнози всташа на мя, мнози глаголевть о души моєи и ньсть спасения ему о Богъ его. Ты же, Господи, защитникъ мой еси," and проче псалма.\textsuperscript{40} By contrast to the chronicler’s account, where excerpts from the Psalter highlight the parallel between Boris’ suffering and Christ’s, Nestor ends Boris’ one quotation from the Psalter so that it expresses his confident faith in God, his protector.

After the Orthros, Nestor includes one final prayer. While this prayer underscores the parallel between Boris and Christ’s suffering, it also emphasizes their common mission:

Благодаря Ты, Владыко Господи, Боже мой, яко сподели мя еси недостойного слугу твоего быти страсті Сына твоего, Господа нашего Иисуса Христа. Послѣ бо единоначадца Сына своего в мире, Его же незаконнымъ предала на смерть; и се азъ посланъ быхъ отъ отца своего, да спасу людей отъ существующихъ ему погань, - и се нынѣ уязвень есмь отъ рабъ отца своего. Ны, Владыко, отдай же имя грешенъ, менѣ же колой съ святыми и не предай же менѣ въ руки враговъ, яко Ты еси защититель мої, Господи, и въ рукахъ твоихъ предай духъ мой.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{38} It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish’ (John 11:50).
\textsuperscript{39} Müller notes that Boris oversteps his role in singing Matins since this is technically the presbyter’s role (Müller, ‘Studien’, p.312). The \textit{Povest’ vremennykh leт} account contains no reference to a presbyter, while the \textit{Chtenie} observes correct liturgical procedure in ordering the presbyter to begin Matins. It is to be expected that the \textit{Chtenie} would be more concerned with proper order.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Chtenie}, p.11
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Chtenie}, p.11
Unusually for a martyr’s final prayer, Boris addresses himself to God the Father rather than to Christ. This address introduces greater distance and perspective on his suffering and means that Boris can draw a closer parallel between his role as defender and saviour of his people against the hostile pagans, and Christ’s mission of bringing salvation. Like Christ, Boris too is sent by his father. Rather than directly accuse Sviatopolk as the mastermind behind the murder, Boris identifies the murderers as his father’s servants. Christ’s persecutors were also considered to be servants of God, his father. In this way the theme of a brother’s betrayal is weakened. Rather than dwell on the painful relationships between members of his immediate family, Nestor appears to highlight Boris’ responsibility for the community. In the chronicle account and the Skazanie, more is made of the fact that Boris is betrayed above all at the hands of his brother. Although Boris’ prayer in the Chtenie refers to physical wounding, he neither uses the word ‘страд’, (particularly resonant of Christ’s passion in the prayer of the chronicler’s account), nor speaks of the ‘wounding of the heart’, a phrase Boris uses in his final prayer in the Skazanie to describe the agony of betrayal. Nestor appears to superimpose onto a story of dynastic feuding particular elements of the account of Christ’s crucifixion, so that the themes of nonresistance and suffering acquire a new focus of salvation. The comparison of Boris with Christ as depicted in his final prayers in the Chtenie is seen to be more schematic and brings to the fore the heavenly model of the relationship between Father and Son.

In the Chtenie Nestor engineers the circumstances of Gleb’s martyrdom so that he steps out of Boris’ shadow, becoming a martyr in his own right. One element of the plot which is unique to Nestor’s vita is the fact that Gleb knows about his father’s death and Sviatopolk’s design against his brother even before Boris is told. Before Gleb flees Kiev, Nestor puts this prayer into his mouth:
Rather than appear later as an unsuspecting victim, stricken by grief at the news of his father’s and brother’s death, Gleb’s prayer expresses his submission to God’s will. Once again, the prayer underlines God’s sovereignty and omniscience. Gleb addresses Christ as the one for whom everything is made and who is all-knowing. Despite the ‘correctness’ of the prayer, two points jar with the narrative. First, Gleb intimates his brother’s intention to kill him even though he only knows for certain about the plot against Boris. This is at odds with the extreme reluctance both brothers show later in believing that Sviatopolk or the killers will indeed murder them. Second, the ensuing events suggest that though God does not intend him to die in Kiev, he does not answer his prayer to save him from death as he flees.

When his pursuers approach, Gleb’s men take up their weapons in order to defend him. Here Nestor paints a different picture from the Skazanie, where Gleb’s men are few in number and paralyzed with fear. In order to persuade his men to withdraw to the shore, Gleb reasons that by not resisting they will in fact save lives, besides which, he is confident of a favourable reception from Sviatopolk. These arguments show that Gleb, like Boris, is concerned for the wider community and he too echoes Caiaphas’ words by remarking that it is better for one to die on behalf of many. As Gleb’s boat sails alone mid-stream, he sights his killers, quoting a section from the Psalter as they close in on him.

42 Chtenie, p.8
This quotation marks an important departure from the depiction of Gleb’s martyrdom in the *Skazanie* and the *Povest’ vremennykh let*. Rather than protest his innocence and suffering, here Gleb asks God to rise to his defence and bring down those who intend to harm him. While such a petition is in keeping with the defiant tone of prayers spoken by the martyrs when they face their accusers, it contrasts sharply with Boris’ quotations in the chronicler’s account which focus on his Christ-like suffering. Earlier in the narrative Nestor depicts Gleb as a fighting and victorious figure when he expands on his baptismal name - David. Like David, Gleb too is portrayed as a fighter who wins the victory over Satan and takes away the shame of the sons of Rus’. Instead of being marked by lament and ancestral prayer, Gleb’s last moments in the *Chtenie* show him as a fighter in spiritual terms, whose concern is for his people.

Gleb’s final prayer is said facing the naked blade of a knife bared by his cook, who murders him. Before Gleb prays, he is silent, a silence which is compared to that of a blameless lamb, “светый же Господь Мачаши, Акы Апия Нэвемие“.

His prayer shows no confusion, and in it Gleb likens himself to the prophet Zechariah, whose feast is celebrated on the day of his death. Here Nestor does not rely primarily on a portrait of Christ-like suffering but looks to another precedent to provide an additional and more exact analogy:

---

43 *Chtenie*, p.12, Psalm 34:1-12
44 *Chtenie*, p.6
45 *Chtenie*, p.13
Zechariah was noted for his silence and his saving concern for others. According to apocryphal sources, he was killed while serving in the temple for his refusal to reveal the whereabouts of his son John the Baptist to those who had come to harm him. Courage rather than fear motivate Zechariah’s silence, so that Gleb’s silence by analogy is perceived as a sign of strength rather than weakness. The parallel is reinforced by the use of the same verbs to record the fate of both men, ‘закланы бысть’ and ‘закланы быхъ’. By using the past tense Gleb speaks of his death as though it had already happened, thereby making the parallel with Zechariah more exact. In the second half of the prayer Gleb prepares to meet God, asking for forgiveness and a safe passage for his soul. Overall, Nestor presents a different Gleb compared with the grief-stricken young prince of the Skazanie who fears his assailants and protests his innocence. In some ways Nestor’s portrayal of Gleb is closest to that of a conventional martyr and furthest from the emphasis on suffering and sacrifice generally associated with the two princes. Characteristically, Nestor only pencils in the drama of the princely house, choosing instead to stress Gleb’s concern for the wider community. Gleb’s point of reference is not found in his attachment to Boris, but rather in the Biblical precedent of Zechariah.

---

46 Chtenie, p.13
The *Skazanie* begins the narrative with a quotation: ‘ра̀дь правыхъ благословится, речь пророкъ, и сьмя ихь къ благословеніи будьть’.\(^48\) This opening line signals the leading idea, that the righteous family, in this instance the ruling clan of Rus’, will blessed. Indirectly the writer also indicates the divine sanction given to the princely family, who are descended from the Riurik dynasty. Accordingly, the scene begins not with a synopsis of Christian world history, nor the wider background of Christendom as in the *Chtenie*, but with a record of Vladimir’s family tree stretching back to the pagan days of Sviatoslav and Igor’. The theme of family relationships is further strengthened by an account of Boris’ great affection for his father and his willingness to obey him, which follows.

In the *Skazanie* Boris’ initial reflections on his martyrdom and his laments are prolix compared to brief prayers interjected at moments of resolve.\(^49\) This method allows Boris to express his grief in lament, and his evolving perception of his martyrdom in his reflections, thereby avoiding the impression that the prayers are spoken unthinkingly as an automatic response. In the face of death, however, Boris’ prayers become increasingly dominant and form the main vehicle of communication.

After the men have dispersed, Boris retires to his tent, and weeping, prays: ‘сѧль ми́хь не прѣьми, кла̀дько, да яко жь упокою на Тѧ, тако да с твоими рабы приими часть и жрении сь всѧми святыми твоими.’\(^50\) Here Boris looks for heavenly reward rather than for salvation in this life. As his murderers approach, he mentally concentrates on his suffering and his reward in keeping with the consciousness of a traditional martyr. Like the chronicler’s Boris, Nestor’s Boris sings three quotations from the ‘six psalms’, but in a

\(^{48}\) *Skazanie*, p.27

\(^{49}\) After a period of reflection, Boris prays with words echoing the anguished scene in the garden of Gethsemane, ‘вас тевъ да будьть, глагодь мнъ’ (*Skazanie*, p.30). Again, with renewed joy Boris prays ‘не прѣьми мнъ, рабь, глагодь приими, упокою на Тѧ, не отрѧя душь мнъ’ (*Skazanie*, p.31). Rather than seek rescue from trouble, a request which is not granted to the brothers in the *Chtenie*, Boris asks for the salvation of his soul. This prayer is vindicated by his subsequent reward.

\(^{50}\) *Skazanie*, p.33
shorter form. After Boris sings the beginning of the first psalm, ‘Господи, что се умножиша съзвучаніи, мнози ексташа на мя’, he indicates the ‘six psalms’ more generally with the remark ‘и прочиє псалмы до конца’. Continuing with excerpts from the Psalter, Boris sings the first part of verse seventeen, ‘обидаша мя пи мнози’, and then jumps back to the second part of verse thirteen, ‘и уныши тучны одежаша мя’, omitting the phrase quoted in by the chronicler ‘своѣ засиякыхъ востае мя’. Rather than merging these extracts with an excerpt from psalm seven, the writer indicates a division by the phrase ‘и пакы’, shortening the quotation to ‘Господи, Боже мой, на Тя уповах, спаси мя’.

While it may be tempting to speculate on a common source for both the Skazanie and the Povest' vremennykh let account, it is difficult to reconstruct an ‘original’. What emerges is, that the combined effect of shortening the extracts from the Psalter and increasing the number of prayers which follow, lessens the prominence of the Psalter quotations in the overall scheme of the narrative.

Boris also says a prayer before the icon of Christ, but once again compared with the chronicler’s version, omits several phrases:

Господи Иисусе Христе, иже симь образомъ явися на земли, избави́ и воевь́ пригово́дитися на кресте и принимъ страсті Грехъ ради нашему! Спаси и мя прияти страсть.

As well as one or two words, the writer omits the two final points of the chronicler’s version of the prayer - his brother’s guilt, and his own willing forgiveness (се же не въ грѣхъ принимо но въ грѣхъ брата своего, и не створи мя Господи въ семь грѣхъ). Granting forgiveness generally characterizes the martyr’s last words which at this point in the Skazanie would seem premature. The Orthros is only the first stage of the build-up to Boris’ death, in which two longer prayers feature.

51 Skazanie, p.34
52 Skazanie, p.34
The two longer prayers act as Boris’ last words, the first being uttered just before his assailants lunge at him from outside the tent, and the second when Boris emerges wounded. Although the prayers are similar, they are not identical and crescendo in length and intensity to the point of his death. Rather than introduce a new perception of Boris’ martyrdom, the prayers to an extent sum up the conclusions he has reached in his reflections. In keeping with traditional *martyria* both prayers begin on a triumphant note:

---

Here Boris’ nonresistance and suffering are interpreted in the light of obedience to the New Testament commands. His love for God’s words is seen in a practical demonstration of self-sacrificing love for his brother. The thoughts and even some of the expressions in this prayer are already anticipated in earlier passages of the *Skazanie*. For example, on the night before his own murder Boris contemplates the martyrdom and suffering of others killed by their family - Nicetas, Wenceslas and Barbara. He too wonders how he will submit to his suffering (како прідатися на...

53 Polycarp’s final prayer exemplifies this attitude: ‘O Lord, omnipotent God and Father of your beloved and blessed child Christ Jesus, through whom we have received our knowledge of you, the God of the angels, the powers, and of all creation, and of all the family of the good who live in your sight; I bless you because you have thought me worthy of this day and this hour, to have a share among the number of the martyrs in the cup of your Christ, for the resurrection unto eternal life of both the soul and the body in the immortality of the Holy Spirit. May I be received this day among them before your face as a rich and acceptable sacrifice, as you, the God of truth who cannot deceive, have prepared, revealed, and fulfilled beforehand. Hence I praise you, I bless you, and I glorify you above all things, through that eternal and celestial high priest, Jesus Christ, your beloved child, through whom is glory to you with him and the Holy Spirit now and for all ages to come. Amen’. See H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford, 1972, (hereafter Musurillo, *The Acts*), p.13.

54 *Skazanie*, p.34

---

102
Earlier when Boris decided neither to flee nor oppose his brother, but rather to go to him, he quotes the New Testament words, ‘никё рече: “Бога любя”, а брата своего ненавидите, - лежь есть’. И пакы: “беззакония любя нять, святыни любя взять изымает страхъ”’. 55 Here ‘brother’ is seen not only to refer to the wider Christian community but more poignantly to his own brother. Boris underlines his selfless love by quoting from St Paul, ‘love bears all things, believes all things’ (любы всес тьпить, всему веру вмьстить). He also adds, ‘love... does not insist on its own way’ (и не ищать своих си), a phrase which occurs earlier in Paul’s treatise on love and here illustrates Boris’ deference to his brother. 56 While it is common for writers of martyria to base a saint’s prayers on extracts from the Psalter, interspersed with a couple of well-known words uttered by Christ or Stephen the Martyr before their death, the inclusion of these New Testament quotations on love distinguish Boris’ prayers in the Skazanie, keeping the focus on the expression of his faith being his love, particularly the love he shows his perfidious brother.

The second prayer is longer and more ornate. As well praising God’s mercy, it crystallizes the picture of Boris as a martyr and comments on the particular circumstances of his martyrdom. His elaborate invocation, ‘Господи Боже мой, многомилостивый и милостивый и премилостивый!’ 57 while lacking logical ordering, nevertheless reiterates God’s mercy. Boris regards his martyrdom as a privilege, a standard sentiment uttered by martyrs with their dying breath:

Слава Ти, яко съпощебъм мя увенчани отъ предали жития сего лъстянем.
Слава Ти, пристодъйный живодельч, яко сподоби мя трудъ святыхъ мученикъ.
Слава Ти, Владыко человъколюбч, сподоби мя съкончяти худенине

55 Skazanie, p.30
56 1 Corinthians 13:5
57 Skazanie, p.35
The single cry ‘Слава Ти’ in his earlier prayer is now multiplied fourfold. Thrice he praises God for making him worthy. He traces the process of his martyrdom; first, fleeing the deceit of this life, second, performing the deed of a martyr and thereby achieving his heart’s desire so that at last he can run to Christ without hindrance. Martyrdom is no longer expressed in the conditional tense. After praising God Boris turns his attention to the particular setting of his martyrdom and his brother’s part in it:

This concluding section of Boris’ prayer highlights the suffering caused by his brother’s betrayal. Boris points not only to physical suffering, but to the spiritual and emotional suffering inflicted on his heart by a member of his family. He compares his suffering to the daily death described by the apostle Paul, and to a sheep being led to slaughter, an image echoing Christ’s sacrifice. Despite his suffering, Boris repeats three times that he did not resist his brother and neither thought nor spoke evil of him. Boris

58 Skazanie, p.35-6
59 Skazanie, p.36
60 Boris’ quotation echoes a number of Biblical passages: ‘like a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearsers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth’ (Isaiah 53:7), ‘Thou has made us like sheep for slaughter’ (Psalms 44:11), which is echoed by Paul, ‘For thy sake we are being killed all the day long; we are regarded as sheep to be slaughtered’ (Romans 8:36).
does not neglect to mention his ability to resist with all of his father’s soldiers. By contrast, he comments that his brother has done all the harm he possibly could. Identifying with the psalmist’s experience of betrayal by those closest to him, Boris asks that God’s justice will prevail and that God may not count his brother’s sin against him. Thus in the second extended prayer, Boris is depicted as a classical martyr victoriously praising God, and as a sufferer who bears the wounds of betrayal in his heart and body for his love of God’s word. His emphasis on the hurt caused by the enmity of a brother draws attention to the importance of interprincely relations which affected Rus’. A crime against one’s brother and prince was seen as a denial of what is seen to lie at the heart of the Christian faith - love.

In the *Skazanie* Gleb’s martyrdom resembles the chronicler’s account but here the writer separates the different elements of lament, ancestral prayer and Christian prayer. Gleb speaks four times; first with a lament, second to protest his innocence and youth to his assassins, third to cry out to his family, and finally he prays in the teeth of death, affirming his faith.

Gleb’s lament mourns his double loss of father and brother, an expression of grief which is intensified by using combinations of paired words. When the killers draw alongside Gleb’s boat and he sees their drawn swords, he protests his innocence and promises his obedience, begging them to spare his youth. Gleb’s youth is then transformed into a series of images redolent with Biblical and classical symbolism. He depicts himself as an unripe harvest, as one who enjoys the milk of innocence, a young vine which is not ready to be cut. In desperation he cries out, ‘князь, брати, и звёзды, и хвалыстывь ещё младением, се несть убийство, не смердение. Чьто зло сотвориши?’ This cry contrasts with a number of

---

61 *Оте дядо плачешь и стонь, дядо смотрей с сокров и тужь! Увы мне, увы мне!* (*Skazanie*, p.39).

62 *И покажет мне ещё житие и сефедло, и покажет конца не уви сефедлеша, не покажет сефедлеша, не покажет конце конца. Не покажет лены, не до конца сефедлеша, а плакь имуда!* (*Skazanie*, p.41).

63 *Skazanie*, p.41
martyria, in which the judge pleads with the martyr to recant so as to spare their youth. Also untypical of a martyr is Gleb’s farewell to his family, those dead and alive, as well as his supplication to Vladimir and Boris. Most martyrs spurn the attempts of their family to save them from death. By contrast, Gleb’s outbursts are reminiscent of ancestral prayer, a feature which Komarovich identifies in the portrayal of the princes in the Povest’ vremennykh let. Gleb takes his leave by force (нужно) rather than voluntarily (волей), the attitude which marked Christ’s suffering. However, by the end of Gleb’s final prayer, he offers himself willingly:

Вижь, съемление съезда моего: се бо закалымь есмь, не внемъ, чьто ради
или за котеруо обиду, не съведы: ты внемъ, Господи, Господи мой! Внемъ Ты,
рекы: къ семы: апостоломъ, яко 'за имя моемъ, Мене ради взыкнайте на вы
руки, и предани будете радыми и другы, и братъ брата предать на смерть,
и умретесть вы имене моего ради'; и пакы: 'въ търпѣни и кащенъ сдѣжите
душа ваша'. Вижь, Господи, и суди, се бо гостью есть душа моей предъ
Тобою, Господи, и Тебе славу взыкнайте Отцу и Сыну и Святому Духу
нынѣ и присно и въ еякъ екомъ Аминь.

Gleb does not speak with the confidence displayed by his brother or a conventional martyr. Even in the face of death he is haunted by the question of why he is suffering. From the negative ‘I do not know’, he turns to God’s knowledge, ‘you know’, reaffirming the source of his confidence - the words from the New Testament. He accepts these New Testament

64 Lenhoff notes that invoking dead relatives was a characteristic of pagan Slav ancestor worship. See G. Lenhoff, The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Socio-cultural Study of the Cult and the Texts, Columbus, Ohio, 1989, p.37.
65 In the martyrium of St Phileas, his brother is one of the lawyers. As they lead Phileas to his execution, his brother cries out that Phileas himself requests it be halted. Phileas replies to his brother that he has made no such appeal, ‘Rather I owe great thanks to the emperors and to the prefect that I have been made a co-heir of Christ Jesus’ (Musurillo, The Acts, p.353).
67 Skazanie, p.42
quotations as an explanation of his suffering. Rather than recalling the positive command to love one’s brother, Gleb reminds himself of quotations which depict him as the one persecuted for Christ’s sake. Like Boris, he too is struck by his brother’s act of betrayal, and asks God to judge. Gleb’s closing words show him offering his soul to God as if in readiness for sacrifice. Now he is in a position to command his killers to carry out their mission and only then does Goriasser order Gleb to be killed. The writer continues in much the same way as the chronicler by describing Gleb as a sacrifice pleasing to God. He too likens Gleb to an innocent lamb (єспасливого місця), thereby confirming his protestation of innocence. Only in Gleb’s final prayer is he seen to understand his own martyrdom and like the chronicler’s account, the main impact of his martyrdom is its sacrifice.

According to the Zhitie Feodosiia there is only one ruler sovereign over world history and the affairs of Rus’ - the heavenly one. By comparison, the Skazanie and the Povest’ vremennykh let show more interest in the princely clan ruling on earth over Rus’ - Vladimir’s descendants. In the chronicler’s account, while Boris’ quotations from the Psalter are shown to be more closely aligned with the imitatio Christi theme than generally assumed, Gleb when faced with death expresses his relationship foremost with his family rather than with God. The writer relies on the evocative concept of accepting suffering (strast’) to provide an explanation for Gleb’s martyrdom. Within the wider context of the chronicle, the blood of the two brothers makes Rus’ a terra sancta, giving Vladimir’s dynasty claim to two powerful intercessors and two martyrs for the faith.

In the Chtenie Nestor introduces a new perspective so that from the outset both the conversion of Rus’ and the brothers’ martyrdom fits into the wider divine plan of salvation. The regular timing, format and manner of prayers in the Chtenie also deliver the same message of divine order in human affairs. In the prayers Biblical models tend to predominate over both
national concerns and family relationships, so that Christian spirituality is seen to be distinct from purely natural affection. This separation may be one reason for the notorious coolness of Nestor’s narrative when compared with the *Skazanie*. In general, the *Chtenie* concentrates on the vertical relationship between man and God, playing down the dynamic of relationships within the princely house. This emphasis points to a model which is applicable for all people, not just the ruling family. One way Nestor plays down the family ties is by levelling off the differences between the brothers, so that even Gleb’s silent death becomes a sign of courageous sacrifice. The brothers’ martyrdom is founded not simply on the concept of suffering and nonresistance, but on the specific parallel with Christ’s mission of salvation. The prince is regarded as the saviour of his men and in more general terms as defender of Rus’ against the pagans. It is this aspect of salvation on which Nestor focusses, particularly in Boris’ final prayer. Denuded of elements of lament and ancestral prayer, Nestor fuses the Christian image of a martyr with an ideal for the rulers of Rus’ - a saviour who is modelled on Christ.

By contrast, the *Skazanie* elevates the national history of Rus’ and of the ruling dynasty. The writer interweaves elements of lament, reflection and prayer, creating a more emotive and at times dramatic picture. One key element in Boris and Gleb’s martyrdom is the fact that it occurs at the hands of a brother. In contrast to this act of treachery, the writer points to the Christian model of brotherly love demonstrated by Boris and Gleb. The emphasis on brotherly love gives the writer scope to develop the emotive aspect of family relationships. As well as underlining dynastic ties, the writer stresses in the prayers that Boris and Gleb are dying for their obedience and their faith in Christ’s words. This reasoning brings them into line with the rationale of traditional martyrs who died for their faith in God’s words. In the brothers’ final prayers the writer also intertwines apparently conflicting elements - the triumph and praise heard in the prayers
of conventional *martyria* with the heartache of a brother’s betrayal. Gleb’s last words are seen to be disentangled, retaining lament, ancestral prayer and a more classical final prayer.

The martyrdom of Boris and Gleb was undeniably perceived by the writers of their martyrdom as an event of enormous significance in the life of Rus’. A study of the prayers throws into relief the writers’ struggle to portray the brothers’ martyrdom. While the chronicler focusses on Christ-like suffering, sacrifice and human grief, in the *Skazanie* and *Chtenie* the prayers offer a spiritual and political message designed to promote harmony within the ruling house. The writer of the *Skazanie* stresses the family ties and Christian brotherly love by which Boris and Gleb are seen to overcome the most cutting betrayal from one’s own brother, while Nestor emphasizes that the need for the princes to see beyond immediate family ties, to a Christ-like vision of bringing salvation to other people. Judging by the popularity of the *Skazanie*, it was the Christian imperative of brotherly love fused with an emotive portrayal of relationships within the ruling house, that most memorably expressed the phenomenon of the princely martyrs. Immortalized by the writers of their story, Boris and Gleb’s reputation as defenders and intercessors on behalf of Rus’ would outlive the squalid circumstances surrounding their murder.
Unity in the prayer attributed to Ilarion

‘В Т К И Д И пукава зема стала есть’ - a phrase which forms part of the title of the Povest' vremennykh let, also makes an appropriate title for Ilarion's work Slovo o zakone i blagodati which is followed by a prayer. Ilarion, who was writing probably as a third generation Christian since his country’s official conversion, and also as the first native candidate to be selected as Metropolitan, shows great concern to establish the identity of Rus' as a Christian nation. In contrast to pre-Christian days, when the area known as Rus' was inhabited, according to the chronicler, by different tribes who lived completely different lifestyles, Rus’ now was to have an ideology which could fashion a single identity.\(^1\)

What united the people of Rus'? The chronicler answers this question by first tracing their literal descent to Noah's son Japheth. Ilarion can be seen to answer this question with a sermon, a eulogy and a prayer. In order to focus first on Ilarion’s perception of Rus’ as a land inhabited now by God’s people, I have worked from the assumption that the prayer is linked to the Slovo o zakone i blagodati. The ordering of sermon, eulogy, and prayer is found in only one fifteenth-century Synodal manuscript. After the prayer follow two confessions of faith, and a colophon. This last entry informs the reader that Ilarion, a monk and presbyter, was enthroned.

\(^1\) After describing the practices of the Slav tribes, especially with regard to their different marriage customs, the chronicler concludes that Christians in all lands who believe in the Trinity, in one baptism, in one faith, all have one law inasmuch as they are baptized into Christ and clothed with him (PVLL, col.16). Here the chronicler emphasizes that the Christian faith is an important unifying factor. A. Poppe, 'Christianity and ideological change in Kievan Rus': the first hundred years', Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 25, 1992, p.6, voices a widely held view that a major factor in the conversion of Rus’ was the search for 'a comprehensive system of beliefs and views that would on the one hand consolidate the ruling class, while on the other help to broaden and deepen the ties between society as a whole and the political organisation of the young, constantly growing state'.
Metropolitan in Kiev by the bishops in the year 1051 during the reign of Prince Iaroslav. Working from this information, it is generally inferred that Ilarion was the author of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. I will return to the question of whether the prayer belongs to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* later.

In the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer Ilarion uses the word 'land' (zemlia) to describe both the country and the people of Rus' as a single identity. The relationship between the people and the land is underlined by phrases such as 'our land', or with reference to the rulers Vladimir I and Iaroslav I, 'his land' and 'your land'. The phrase *'eca hania zemla'* appears to be reserved for striking moments of unity which affect all the people. For example, when grace reaches Rus' it waters our whole land, *'hania eca zemla hania'*.

After the people have been baptized, our whole land praises God, *'eca zemla hania eklaite xrista cy vitisv i cy seatymy daryshm'*. Significantly, the phrase 'our whole land' is found in the title of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript, the only manuscript which unites the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* with the prayer - *'mamteka ke loga wt eca zemla hania'*. Contrary to the opinion that this title has been tagged on by a later

---

2 The information in the colophon is corroborated by the entry in the *PVLL* s.a.1051 (*PVLL*, col. 155-6). This entry also notes that Ilarion served as priest in the church at Berestovo, a place favoured by Iaroslav, and that he prayed regularly in a cave which was to be the site of the future Kievan Caves Monastery. A similar passage is incorporated in the *Kievo-Pecherski Paterik* (*KPP*, pp.16-7).

3 The colophon describes Iaroslav as 'kagan', a title which is also used in the *Pokhvala* of the Synodal manuscript, further indicating their common authorship.

4 The only other country to be honoured with the title 'zemlia' rather than 'strana' is the Byzantine Empire. Müller's hypothesis here is a reasonable one. He suggests that Rus' had strong ties with Byzantium in the fields of religion and culture and therefore was hardly regarded as an alien land. See L. Müller, 'Ilarion Werke', *Forum Slavicum*, 37, 1971, (hereafter Müller, 'Ilarion Werke'), p.74.

5 I shall refer to Ilarion's sermon and eulogy as the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* or the *Slovo*.

Where I differentiate between the separate works, I shall use the terms the *Slovo*, the *Pokhvala* and the prayer. For the text of the *Slovo* and *Pokhvala* I shall use A. Moldovan's edition, *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, Kiev, 1984 (hereafter Moldovan, *Slovo*), and for the text of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript I shall use N.N. Rozov's study in 'Sinodal'nyi spisok sochinenii Ilariona russkogo pisatelya XI veka', *Slavia*, 32, 1963, pp.141-75 (hereafter Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok'). The texts of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer as cited above, are based on a fifteenth-century manuscript, Sin. no.591, GIM.
editor, the phrase, ‘ВСЕ БОЖЬЕ НАШЕ НАИМЕ’, is integral to an understanding of the prayer as a reflection of the new Christian identity of Rus’, a cry of the whole country to God. Like the title of the *Slovo* and the *Pokhvala* which is noted for its accuracy, the title of the prayer also appears to accurately signal the intent of the prayer.\(^6\)

Iharion, however, does not argue for the unity of Rus’ on the basis of one word. At the heart of his sermon, unity is seen to reach its fulfillment through Christ’s mission. He expounds the unity of the Old and New Testaments by criss-crossing the story of Abraham and the giving of the law, with the coming of Jesus and the revelation of grace. At the culminating point of both Testaments, Christ is seen to unite the earthly and heavenly, ‘свяже на едино вселенна и земная, свешеници в едино агехы и человечы’.\(^7\) Now the law is seen to be restricted no longer to one place and one people, but grace radiates from Jerusalem to cover the whole earth, including Rus’. Iharion emphasizes that grace is for all people, and throughout his sermon the refrain ‘по вси земл’ rings out. Thus the land of Rus’ is seen firstly in the larger context of universal unity, which is foremost a spiritual unity that looks forward to the ultimate uniting of the heavenly and the earthly.

With specific reference to Rus’, the *Pokhvala* celebrates Vladimir and then Iaroslav as rulers who help to establish spiritual unity in a concrete way. Significantly, the baptism of Rus’, the crown of Vladimir’s achievement, is depicted as taking place at one time and with a common will. Vladimir and Iaroslav, the focus of authority in Rus’, are set apart by their title ‘kagan’, a title which suggests their sovereign status more

\(^6\) The full title of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* reads: ’О ЗАКОНЕ МНОЖЕСТВА ДАНЕВАЯ, И В БЛАГОСЛЯТИ И ИСТИНЕ БОЖЬЕЙ СВЯЩЕНЫМ; И КАКО ЗАКОН ОТТИЕ, БЛАГОСЛЯТИ Я Е И ИСТИНЬ ЕО ЗЕМЛЯ ИПИИ И ЕВС ЕО ЕСА АДЛЕСЬ ПРЕСЕС, И ДЕ НАШИХ НЕЗКА РОСКУГ; И ПЕКСА ЕОЕНЬЕ НАШЕМУ ВЛАДИМИРУ, 3Т НЕГО ТЕ КРЫШИ ИИНОМ, И МИНИЯ ЕО ЕОЕВЕ ЗЕМЛЯ НАША’ (Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.78, fol.168). Any early title is open to the charge of being added to, or subtracted from, and therefore additional reasons will be cited below for presuming that the works were originally linked together.

\(^7\) Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.81, fol.171v-2
forcefully than the pedestrian ‘kniaz’ used by the chronicler. If Ilarion employs the title ‘kagan’ with such care as has been suggested by scholars, then it comes as no surprise that in the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and in the prayer, he should also develop the use of other words to help to create a united identity for the land and the people of Rus’.

In addition to the term ‘ruskaia zemlia’, Ilarion also attaches special significance to the noun ‘liudie’. In a Biblical context the word ‘people’ generally refers to those who belong to God as his people. In the Slovo Ilarion elucidates how God opens the way so that all nations can become his people, a privilege reserved in the past for the Hebrew people. Thus the prophetic words cited in the Slovo, ‘и речи князя моего, люди Мои’, are seen also to apply to Rus’. Three times in the prayer the people ask for mercy, reminding God that they are his people. In two instances the cry ‘we are your people’ is followed by two descriptions of the people which underscore a collective and united identity, first as a flock of sheep (мы бо людь наших и ведем пастырь наш, и стадо еще нею начать пасти), and second as an inheritance (мы людь наших, твоя часть, твое достояние). These collective

---

8 For literature on the title ‘kagan’ see inter alia: 1) A. Poppe, ‘Christianity and ideological change in Kievan Rus’: the first hundred years’, Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 25, 1992, p.9, notes that ‘kniaz’ is the Slavonic translation of the usual Greek word for ruler ‘archon’. He argues that Ilarion’s use of the title ‘kagan’ lends Princes Vladimir and Laroslav rank which does not directly challenge the Greek hierarchy but nevertheless commands respect and honour. On the other hand he suggests, the title ‘kniaz’ would sound lame. 2) W. Vodoff, ‘La titulature des princes russes du XIe s. au début du XIIe s. et les relations extérieures de la Russie Kiévienne’, Revue des études slaves, 55, 1983, pp.139-50, observes that early bookmen used ‘kniaz’ to denote the sovereigns of Kiev and the other princes, reckoning that it eclipsed other titles such as kagan by the end of the eleventh century. He comments on the apparent ‘indifference’ toward titles felt by rulers. 3) J. Arrignon, ‘Remarques sur le titre de kagan attribué aux princes russes d’après les sources occidentales et russes des IXe-Xle s.’, Recueil des travaux de l’Institut d’études byzantines, 23, 1984, pp.63-71, suggests that ‘kagan’ is a ‘vacant’ title from the days of the Khazarion kaganate, which signifies both political sovereignty and dynastic legitimacy without ruffling Byzantine feathers. 4) A. Novosel’tsev, ‘K voprosu ob odnom iz drevneishikh titulov russkogo kniazia’, Istoriia SSSR, 4, 1982, pp.150-9, investigates the historical context of the word ‘kagan’ and links it to events occurring in Ilarion’s lifetime. My study concentrates on the way Ilarion uses certain words and creates an identity around them, rather than on investigating the origins of a word, or the coinage of new words.

9 Moldovan, Slovo, pp.89-90, fol.182
10 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.195v
11 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.198
expressions reinforce Ilarion’s attempt to form a corporate identity for ‘our whole land’.

‘Land and people’ are shown to ring out like a slogan, conveying two essential criteria for national self-definition. In the Old Testament the people of Israel were seen to be God’s people, whose belonging to God and identity as his people, was bound up with their land. Exile from their land was seen as punishment and alienation from God. According to a similar principle, the prayer interprets the people’s belonging to their land as a sign of God’s blessing. Conversely, the threat of being a people without a land, exiled and disinherit, is regarded as a severe punishment. These images of exile and disinheritance provide the finale for two sections of confession in the prayer. In the first section placed at the beginning of the prayer, the people see themselves potentially as outcasts and fugitives (πετωχοί) from their Lord. In the second section, the people recall the desolation of Jerusalem and ask God not to bring on them the same fate, ‘νε ό στεφομένον

The contiguous dative plural pronouns ‘ναμέ να και άνθρωποι’ underline the parallel. Likewise, two dative present participles describing the people’s sin, ‘ναμέ του θεού οι Χριστοχνήσιμοι’ and ‘ναμέ του θεού οι Χριστοχνήσιμοι’, parallel two dative past participles, depicting the sin of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, ‘Χριστοχνήσιμοι τα’ and ‘ναμέ του θεού οι Χριστοχνήσιμοι εν πιστει της’. The writer indicates that the land of Rus’ and the Jewish homeland may share a common destiny of disinheritance, unless Rus’ repents. This possible punishment echoes the depiction in the Slovo of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem as he foresees the result of their rejection of him - its destruction. Ilarion remarks on the fate of the Jews in the Slovo by noting that they were scattered among different countries in fulfilment of Christ’s prophecy. In Ilarion’s prayer a further petition implores God to safeguard their city so that they will not be aliens in a land which is not

12 'Ινδυστατες ευ ιππασι, ιη θανον πο αυτο νακε ο ωμχων και προκακανης ωνανον, ιη προκακανης οιδον ων καμανα' (Moldovan, Slovo, p.87, fol.179).
their own: 'ΔΔ η προελεύσα γραβ της, γραβ πλευσα, α κ άδω της, προσελκφεν κε ημεμον.' Implicit in the negative description of 'ημεμον' is the positive idea of a country which is their own, a country which can be called 'our land'.

Rather than define Rus' negatively, in terms of what it is not, Ilarion chooses positive definition. By contrast to the Povest' vremennykh let, Ilarion's eulogy does not portray Vladimir as a pagan who became a saint, but depicts him as an intelligent and just ruler who is enlightened by God. Likewise, the people of Rus' are not called pagans before their conversion. Images such as idolatrous dusk or parched land are employed to describe pre-Christian Rus' in the Slovo, indicating a process of enlightenment and watering. Such imagery points to a natural state destined to be changed rather than condemning people for not having worshipped God previously.

Returning to the question of whether Ilarion is indeed the author of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and the prayer, evidence does not stop at the colophon with its note of his enthronement as Metropolitan. Another point

---

13 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.172, fol.198v
14 Müller explains Ilarion's use of 'liudie' in the Slovo o zakone i blagodati by reference to the translation of the Septuagint. He suggests that its translators described God's holy and chosen people as 'laos', and the surrounding nations as 'ethnos', a distinction which is preserved in Ilarion's work by the use of 'liudie' and 'iazyk' respectively. Furthermore, he observes that while 'liudie', is used primarily for the people of Rus', 'zemlia' is reserved to describe Rus' and its people, or the Greek land. Other nations are designated by the terms 'strana', 'iazyk' or 'narod' (Müller, 'Ilarion Werke', pp.61-79). By contrast the Povest' vremennykh let does not appear to differentiate between 'zemlia' and 'strana'. For example, Vladimir uses the word 'zemlia' when he asks the Jewish emissaries the whereabouts of their country, 'Где есть земля ваша?'. When they reply that their country (zemla nasha) has been given to the Christians, Vladimir questions why, if God was pleased with their religion, did he scatter them among foreign lands, once again using the word 'zemlia' - 'Где есть земля ваши?' (PVLL, col.85-6). Although I doubt that the words 'zemlia', 'strana', 'iazyk' and 'liudie' are used as schematically as Müller suggests, nonetheless 'zemlia' and 'liudie' are central to Ilarion's creation of an identity for Rus', not just in the Slovo and Pokhvala, but also in the prayer.

15 In the prayer even other people are called foreigners (юдя) rather than pagans. One exception is the principal manuscript which Rozov uses for the prayer (T-224), according to which the people pray, 'ИМ η προελεύσα ημεμον κε ημεμον νακ ε κρίνεν ρέλας... ΔΔ η προελεύσα ημεμον.' See N.N. Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediya russkogo pisatelya XI veka Ilariona', Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József. Dissertations Slavicae, 9/10, 1975, (hereafter Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia'), p.134.
in favour of Ilarion’s authorship is the unity of thought that characterizes the works in the Synodal manuscript. Rozov describes the overarching theme as patriotic, ‘love for one’s country’, while Müller sees it in the context of the calling of the nations to faith and the conversion of Rus’.\(^{16}\) Toporov interprets the work as enacting a three part ritual expressed in a triad of genres, a sermon, a eulogy and a prayer. Thematically, he discerns three periods - the kingdom of law under Moses, the kingdom of grace marking the beginning of Christianity, and thirdly the entry of Rus’ into the kingdom of grace. Time, Toporov observes, begins in the distant past and increasingly approaches the present until it culminates in the present time and space of the prayer. While acknowledging the interlinking of the three works, Toporov assumes that the \textit{Slovo} and the \textit{Pokhvala} were conceived together, with the prayer as a separate work.\(^{17}\) Moldovan’s views are similar, and he comments on the overarching idea in the works of the Synodal manuscript, describing them as its own kind of trilogy.\(^{18}\) In his recent essay on the \textit{Slovo o zakone i blagodati} Simon Franklin reviews the arguments, proposing that it should be regarded as a single composition, with the three separable parts discussed as a ‘trinity’.\(^{19}\) While I agree with the general thrust of these views, I shall pause to consider additional textual

\(^{16}\) Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’, p.16

\(^{17}\) V. Toporov, ‘Rabotniki odinnadtsatogo chasa - “Slovo o zakone i blagodati” i drevnerusskie realii’, \textit{Russian Literature}, 24, 1988, 1, pp.39-40, examines how clusters of words link the transitions between the \textit{Pokhvala}, the \textit{Slovo} and the prayer. He highlights three groups of words at the end of \textit{Slovo} which sound the keynote for the \textit{Pokhvala}: first words of praise and descriptions of the people and country; second expressions of enthusiasm, and third words which signify collectivity. He traces a similar pattern at the end of the \textit{Pokhvala}, which forms a prelude to the prayer. He lists these word groups as, first, ‘khvala’, ‘slava’, ‘poklonenie’, ‘zemlia’, ‘strana’, ‘iazyki’, ‘liudi’; second, ‘pet’, ‘veselit’sia’, ‘radovat’sia’, ‘vosklitsat’, ‘pleskat’ rukami’; and third, ‘ves’, ‘vsiaki’. \(^{18}\) See A. Moldovan, ‘K voprosu o sviazi “Molity” Ilariona so “Slovom o zakone i blagodati”’, \textit{Istoriia russkogo izyka i lingvisticheskoe istochnikovedenie}, ed. V.V. Ivanov & A.I. Sumkina, Moscow, 1987, (hereafter Moldovan, ‘K voprosu’), p.156.\(^{19}\) Simon Franklin (tr. & intro.), \textit{Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus’}, (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations V), Cambridge, Mass., 1991, xxvii-viii, cites in support of his view the logical and thematic progression which unites the works. He also comments on the unreliability of assuming that certain combinations of genres and length must determine the shape of the work. In addition, he points to the opening words of the prayer which support its linking with the \textit{Slovo o zakone i blagodati}.\n
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arguments which point to Ilarion’s authorship of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer.

It must be remembered that only the Synodal manuscript links the *Slovo*, the *Pokhvala* and the prayer, while in all other known manuscripts the prayer occurs independently from either the *Slovo* or the *Pokhvala*. This begs the question of whether the prayer was originally an integral part of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* or added later. Superficially, Ilarion’s works are not indicated clearly as his own in the Synodal manuscript. Although all the works are written by the same hand, no mark or new line separates the end of the prayer from the beginning of the confession of faith. This contrasts with the prayer which is marked by a separate heading ‘molitva’ and begins with an uppercase letter which straddles three lines. Only the beginning of the *Slovo* is comparable with the first letter of the opening word ‘blagosloven’ which spans the height of four lines. However, as Gorskii observes, in *vita* prayers are often indicated by a cinnabar title and therefore a distinctive title marking the prayer is not exceptional. Whether the uppercase letters or the lack of marking for the confession of faith is due to scribal oversight or deliberate decision, is difficult to determine. Clearly, the question of the shape of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* cannot be judged exclusively on this basis.

Rather than rehearse all the arguments for and against the linking of the prayer with the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, I shall concentrate on those which have the most bearing on the text of the prayer. While it is

---

23 Rozov also comments on these markings, noting that the end of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* is finished with a special mark that is not found again in the cycle of works attributed to Ilarion. He also points to a large initial letter ‘m’ on fol.169v which is distinctive but appears unmotivated (Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, pp.145-6).
24 Gorskii argues in favour of Ilarion’s authorship of the prayer and its connection to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, pointing to the internal coherence of the work evident in 1) the customary
impossible to prove either that Ilarion is the author of the prayer or that the prayer is integral to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, nevertheless the prayer can be shown to originate from the early period after the conversion of Rus'.

A full critical edition of the prayer is still lacking. On the basis of twelve manuscripts, Rozov identifies two redactions: the long prayer, reflected in the Synodal manuscript, and the short prayer, in which the second half of the prayer is significantly altered. In addition to the Synodal manuscript, I shall be using Rozov's study and three other manuscripts.

First the prayer will be considered in its setting of the fifteenth-century Synodal manuscript. Following the results of Moldovan's study of the *Slovo* and the *Pokhvala*, which led him to conclude that the Synodal manuscript is distinguished by an archaic level of language, notwithstanding its later date and overlay of features normally associated with the so-called glorification of the Trinity at the end of a work which is fulfilled by the prayer. 2) the closing idea of the *Pokhvala* is continued in the opening words of the prayer. 3) the prayer is mentioned in the title. 4) references which depict the Church as new or small reflect Jaroslav's era. See Gorskii, 'Pamiatniki', pp.211-12. Although 1) is untenable since it is impossible to be certain of the shape of the original work, the other three points are reinforced by this study, including 3), which is generally rejected since titles are notoriously unreliable.

Rozov comments that only the nomocanons and pre-revolutionary catalogues list the prayer under Ilarion's name, which makes it difficult to locate in manuscripts. Two principles guide his choice of manuscripts: first, he selects for his principal text the earliest manuscript, and second he chooses unpublished manuscripts. Citing Rozov's bibliographical details, his principal manuscript for the long prayer is in a sluzhebnik s trebnikom, 1474, Tr.-Serg. no.224, RGB, fol.334-7 (hereafter T-224). For details of the variant manuscripts which Rozov uses for the long prayer see 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', pp.124-5 (I have anglicized the letters which signify the manuscripts A, B etc.). Rozov's principal manuscript for the short prayer is a kanonnik, 14th century, Tr.-Serg. no.254, RGB, fol.53-6, (hereafter T-254). For variants of the short prayer see 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', pp.126-7. Rozov reproduces the original orthography for his principal manuscripts but not for the variants, see 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', pp.141-75.

My study uses the prayer in the fifteenth-century Synodal manuscript as the principal manuscript for the long prayer (see Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', pp.147-8) with an additional variant F, in a sixteenth-century kormcha published in Metropolitan Makarii, *Istoriiia russkoi tserkvi*, 3rd edn, St Petersburg, 1889, 1, (Slavica-Reprint 13, Dusseldorf-The Hague, Netherlands, 1968), appendix 7, pp.271-3. Hereafter Makarii, *Istoriiia russkoi tserkvi*.

Second South Slavonic influence, the same conclusion can be drawn regarding the prayer. The archaic features of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript stand out even more clearly when compared with manuscripts T-224 and T-254, the earliest manuscripts of the long and short prayer which Rozov uses. Second, a comparison of stylistic patterning will be made between the prayer of the Synodal manuscript and other manuscripts of the prayer under consideration.

With regard to the archaic level of language, Moldovan comments on the orthographical features of the Slovo and Pokhvala in the Synodal manuscript. He notes that comparatively few words are abbreviated, and when they are, it is in a random fashion which characterizes eleventh-century rather than fifteenth-century manuscripts. Likewise in the prayer ‘milost’, a commonly abbreviated word, in the Synodal manuscript is written out in three out of five instances. In Rozov’s principal manuscripts ‘milost’ is abbreviated consistently. A similar picture can be painted of the abbreviations ‘ΗΑΛΓΥ’ used as a prefix and ‘ΕΑΛΓΥ’ where abbreviation in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript is less radical compared with other manuscripts. Another example occurs in the Synodal manuscript’s description of the Trinity as ‘εΔΗΕΝΗΣΗΣ’, abbreviated in T-224 as ‘εΔΗΕΝΗΣΗΣ’

Admittedly, it is difficult to determine the extent of the so-called Second South Slavonic influence. Moldovan identifies typical South Slav features in the Slovo as the double gamma in the word ‘ΑΠΙΤΑ’, the unjoticized ‘a’ in place of ‘α’or ‘α’, and the dative singular of o-stems ending in ‘ξ’ (with the ‘ξ’ also appearing in word roots and endings). The prayer also exhibits these features. It is less clear whether the mixture of

---

27 Moldovan, Slovo, pp.1-76
28 For example: 1) ‘ΑΠΙΤΑΔΑ’ 2) the genitive feminine ending in ‘τεμα’ rather than ‘τεμα’ (T-254) 3) the dative singular occurs in the words ‘τιμεξ’, ‘εξαξ’ and ‘καιξ’ 4) The root ‘οξ’ appears three times in the prayer, with one exception ‘οξαξ’.
'ж' common to East Slavonic sources, and 'ж',29 reflects residual eleventh-century forms or derives from the Second South Slavonic influence. For example, in the prayer during the intercessions the people intercede for those who thirst, described in the Synodal manuscript as 'cвття... ел...жажу' and in T-224 as 'жаж'.

Reduced vowels which occur in a strong position are generally written as full vowels, a trait which Moldovan observes in the Slovo. In the prayer there are also instances when the reduced vowels are preserved, for example, in the words 'ectество', 'жажа' and 'пред жажа'. One example of an early liquid 'р' survives - 'теппить', which reads in T-224 as 'теппить'. Other traits which Moldovan discovers in the Slovo, such a fairly correct use of 'т' and 'т', and the predominantly unpalatalized velars, also apply to the prayer. Near the end of the prayer the early Russian form 'еъ нем' is unique to the Synodal manuscript. All these features point to an earlier date for the prototype of the manuscript.

Declensions also generally reflect early patterns. The prayer in the Synodal manuscript preserves the dative singular form as 'тепхе' while all the variants of the short prayer, bar one, read 'тепе'.30 Nominative and accusative plural endings of ia-stem nouns end in the more archaic 'н' in the prayer, for example 'дадим' and 'мадним', with the nominative/accusative plural of 'орхия' appearing twice as 'орнди'.31 An older form glimpsed in the Slovo but more visible in the prayer, is the generally correct use of the dative form 'төнб'.

The sheer number of short-form adjectives in the Slovo and the prayer is striking. Two short adjectives 'еъ кр' and 'върхъ' are unique to

29 Moldovan comments that 'ж' is often, though not invariably, written as a titlo. If 'ж' is written on the line, however, it would suggest more strongly an earlier dating.
30 In the genitive plural all the variants of the short prayer employ 'тепхе', whereas the Synodal manuscript reads 'тепхе', an old o-stem ending.
31 While the Synodal manuscript refers to 'дадим нами', T-224 and its variants read 'дадим нами', which is closer to the Old Church Slavonic form.
the prayer in the Synodal manuscript. Evidence of the prayer’s antiquity and linguistic kinship with the *Pokhvala* and the *Slovo* is also seen by the use of the adjective ‘false’, used in the dative singular as ‘Δαιμονία’. Only the prayer of the Synodal manuscript has the uncontracted form of the adjective ‘Δαιμονία’, while other manuscripts of the prayer read ‘Δαιμονία’ or ‘Δαιμονία’ prefixed to ‘Προσκυν’. The same early and uncontracted form is found in the *Slovo* to describe the infallible word of Christ - ‘Προσκυνία’. Another adjective which marks the *Slovo* and the prayer in the Synodal manuscript is ‘carnal’ in the form of ‘παραγωγή’. Instead of ‘παραγωγή’ the other fifteen manuscripts of the short and long prayer use either ‘Προσκυνία’, or more commonly ‘παραγωγή’. In the *Slovo* the adjective occurs as ‘παραγωγή’ and ‘παραγωγή’, and in the latter instance Moldovan notes that the more likely variant is ‘παραγωγή’.

Verb conjugations also reflect earlier forms. In the *Slovo* Moldovan notes the ending ‘τὰ’ for the third person singular and plural in the present and future tenses. In the prayer verbs of the present tense third person plural also generally end with a soft Jer in the Synodal manuscript, for example ‘προσκυνία’ and ‘προσκυνία’. In addition, earlier aorist forms indicate an archaic level of language. Simple aorist forms ending in ‘τὰ’ were relatively rare by the fifteenth century and evidently are a source of confusion for the scribes of the prayer. It is therefore striking that in the Synodal manuscript the two aorist forms are used correctly, ‘μυ... στάδαι εже ονομα ταγατ τας, ιστορο τω ταγκεσ ιδαλκαργκη’.

32 The first reading is found in T-224, variants A, B, C, & D of the long prayer, the second in variants E & F of the long prayer.
33 Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.94, 188v
34 Variant B reads ‘κωμοί παραγον’.
35 See Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.80, fol.171 and p.84, fol.175v respectively.
36 Moldovan admits that this could be a dialectical feature (*Slovo*, p.58).
37 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.195v
and variant B changes the verb forms, significantly altering the meaning, 'стадо иже ново начато паствици, истовни...' In manuscript T-254 the early aorists have disappeared, 'стадо иже ново начато паствици, истовни...'.

Present active participles are also influenced by earlier forms. Possibly a trace of the Common Slavonic combination d+j lingers in the nominal plural 'книгачьи', a reading found in the Synodal manuscript and in T-224. This participle contrasts with other alternative readings - 'книгачьи' (A, B) 'книгачьи' (C) and 'книгачьи' (recorded in the short prayer and its variants). Texts of the prayer also vacillate between the older accusative or the newer genitive plurals of animate objects reflected in the active participles. The Synodal manuscript, T-224 and T-254, manuscripts from the late fourteenth to fifteenth century, more commonly use the accusative rather than the genitive plural. For example, referring to God's promise to accept those who repent, they read 'книгачьи', 'книгачьи' and 'книгачьи' respectively, contrasting with the majority of the variants which employ the genitive 'книгачьи'.

Although the evidence is not conclusive at every point, a brief linguistic survey of the Slovo, the Pokhvala and the prayer suggests first, that the scribe of the Synodal manuscript used a manuscript which reflected an early copy of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati, and second, that the prayer was joined to the Slovo at an early date. The language of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript reveals traces of earlier forms not found in the other known manuscripts of the prayer, neither in T-254 nor in T-224. This comparison is further evidence of the antiquity of the prayer recorded in the Synodal manuscript.

38 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia, p.128
39 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia, p.137
40 See N.A. Meshcherskii, 'K izucheniiu iazyka "Slova o zakone i blagodati"', TOLI, 30, 1976, pp.231-7 & Moldovan, 'K voprosu', passim. Both list a number of these archaic features of the prayer. In addition Moldovan notes that in the Synodal manuscript 'r', 'k' and 'x' are unpalatalized and are followed by 'u'.
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Stylistically, the prayer of the Synodal manuscript is patterned more consistently by triads than other manuscripts which include the prayer. For example, when the people repent the writer lists three verbs, and then expands the petition by elaborating on each verb in turn, ‘克莱ма, пресимъ, молимъ. Клема злыхъ своихъ дела, пресимъ, да страхъ твои послушъ въ сердца наша; молимъ, да на стражь сдѣ́ помилуешь мы’. By contrast, Rozov’s principal manuscript of the long prayer, T-224, spoils this symmetry, ‘молимъ, и клема злыхъ дела, и пресимъ да страхъ твои послушъ въ сердца наша, молимъ да на стражь сдѣ́ помилуешь мы’. Among the variants of the prayer, two follow T-224, another retains the ordering of the Synodal manuscript, a fourth omits the initial listing of the verbs, while two later manuscripts begin with the verb ‘памяться’.

Rozov’s principal manuscript of the short prayer also shows a break in the triad discussed above, ‘克莱ма, и пресимъ, и молимъ въ злыхъ дела, и пресимъ, да страхъ твои послушъ въ сердца наша. Молимъ да на стражь сдѣ́ помилуешь мы’. The variant readings of the short prayer, bar one, omit the repetition of ‘пресимъ’, which also deviates from the triadic arrangement of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript. Having expressed repentance, the writer indicates the sincerity of their petition by a double triad of imperatives, ‘спаси, кржедри, призри, посвяти, смильосердися, помилуй’. These imperatives are crowned with a threefold affirmation that they belong to God, ‘твои есмы, твое сказанье, твоя рука дало’. The short prayer instead employs a pair, omitting the second element, ‘твои есмы, и твоя руку дало’.

---

41 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196v
42 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.131
43 These concern variants A & D; C; B; E, and F respectively.
44 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.139
45 Only variant E retains ‘пресимъ’.
46 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196v
47 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196v-7
48 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.139

---
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finally belonging, is stylistically consistent and suggests that it is earlier than other variants, particularly compared with the text of the short prayer.

Paired expressions are also more meticulously used in the Synodal manuscript. For example, the writer compares human inability to withstand God's anger to dust before a storm, 'не постой в пыле против Бога, и мы против пыли тёней'.49 A later variant of the long prayer, 'аки пыль пред лицем ветра, не уже мали оставиши милости', loses the sharpness of the repeated 'against' and introduces an alternative and related image of transience, the wind.50 Rozov's principal manuscript of the short prayer T-254 also lacks precision and replaces dust with a second reference to the storm, 'не постой в пыле пыли ветра, тако против пыли тёней'.51 The stylistic precision in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript mirrors that of the Slovo and the Pokhvala, providing further evidence that this text more closely reflects its prototype.52

While the Pokhvala naturally seeks to glorify the princes and the achievements of Rus' as an emerging Christian nation, the prayer by its nature confesses the shortcomings of the people of Rus'. The speaker admits that they are still a new and little flock:

Не скажи наша, аще и еще бажаема, не утверди нас, аще и еще
согрешение ти, аки новоукреплений плем, екемь не угодаше Господу своему.

49 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.172, fol.197
50 Variant E. Two other variants of the long prayer D and F also replace the image of the storm with the wind. These images echo Psalm 82 where human transience is described as chaff in the face of the wind 'аки стебли пред лицем ветра' (v.14), and God's anger is seen as a storm 'тако против тени тени тени смолиши да' (v.16, Psalterium Sinaiicum, col.112a).
51 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', p.139. Other variants record 'anger' in place of a repeated reference to 'storm'. An additional pointer to the earlier origin of the Synodal manuscript is also its punctuation. Apart from the lack of marking between the prayer and the confessions of faith, Rozov observes that the works attributed to Ilarion in the Synodal manuscript show consistent and careful punctuation. He notes that the prayer is distinguished by longer sections without punctuation. One reason he suggests for this difference, is that the prayer may have been chanted without expression (Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.150).
Compared with the traditional bastions of Christian faith, such as Rome and Constantinople, Rus' could be regarded as a new flock for a couple of centuries. Rus' could not, however, reasonably be described as a little flock for the same duration of time. The writer refers to their recent conversion as a fact mitigating their continued wandering and sin, and in depicting the people as a little flock, he recalls Jesus’ words spoken to the 'little flock' as though they were intended for Rus'. Various stylistic and syntactic devices mark the internal coherence of this reading. The triad of negative imperatives 'не вставай', 'не утвержай' and 'не възшества', shows the increasing seriousness of God’s response; he could abandon, reject and finally become angry with them. This triad is matched by three clauses, 'аще и еще впадливы', 'аще и еще сърплявъ ти' and 'аще и мало стадо', in which the first clause echoes the phrase which precedes it (reference to their straying follows the invocation of the good shepherd 'пастырь добры, паломивши душу за вѣдѣ'). The third time when they admit their frailty and acknowledge that they are a little flock, their confession is met with the reassuring words of Jesus. By contrast, in T-224 (Rozov’s principal manuscript of the long prayer), the suppliants do not describe themselves as a little flock, though Jesus’ words are still addressed to them as a little flock:

не вставай нас, аще и еще сърплявъ ти, а́ко повшеплѣнны раби къ всѣмъ не оттодаче Господу своимъ, не възшества́ нас, аще и еще впадлиы, не боиса малое мое стадо.  

---

53 Rozov, 'Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.195v
54 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.129. Likewise, T-254, Rozov’s principal manuscript of the short prayer, does not depict the people as a little flock but retains the expressions 'не встарь нась' and 'не пи к намь' in the people’s cry, 'не встарь нас, аще еще сърпляви ти, ако повшепленны раби твои къ всѣмъ не оттодаче Господу своимъ. Не бы́ш въстаетъ насъ, аще и еще впадливы, не утверди насъ, не пи к намъ; не боиса малы мое стадо’ (Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, pp.137-8).
The triadic pattern, together with the increasing seriousness of both the people’s sin and God’s response, is obscured, further reinforcing the suggestion that T-224 is of later provenance than the Synodal manuscript.

The *Pokhvala* also paints a picture of Rus’ as a country which has recently come to know God, whose bishops are described as new fathers. Müller’s observation that the prayer projects a depleted Christianity compared to the picture of a burgeoning faith in the *Pokhvala* is, I would suggest, in keeping with the different intent of both works. In the light of the *Slovo*, new also symbolizes the distinction between the old and new covenants, between law and grace. When Christ’s grace embraces the earth, Ilarion explains the change in terms of old and new, citing ‘new’ three times in a medley of Biblical quotations, ‘ветхая миондоща, и новая как возвещаю.’

ПОЙТЕ ЕСТЬ, ПЕСНЬ НОВУ... РАБОТАЮЩИМ МИ НАРЕЧЕСЛА ИМБ НОВО’. Later in his sermon he again connects what is new with the work of grace, likening the new teaching of grace to new wine, contained in new skins, given to new nations: ‘на ново учение, новы мячы, новы наука’. Thus in the context of the *Slovo*, the identity of Rus’ as a newly pastured flock and new-bought servants may also refer to a nation who enjoys the new teaching of grace.

As well as new, the people’s relationship with God is shown to be dynamic. Within the confines of dogma, the prayer conducts something of a dialogue between the people and God. This is often reflected in the positioning of pronouns. Expressing their whole-hearted devotion to God,

---

56 Comparing the prayer’s depiction of the recent conversion of Rus’ with the *Pokhvala*’s picture of an established and flourishing Christianity, Müller wonders whether the two works were written at different times. See Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’, pp12-16. Another commentator cites Christ’s address to the ‘little flock’ as proof that Christianity was ineffective in changing the pagan culture. This appears to the commentator to contradict the depiction of Iaroslav in the *Pokhvala* as the ruler who consolidates Christianity. The admission of faltering faith is interpreted as evidence of general fragility. See the commentary by T.A.Sumnikova, V.V. Mil’kov and A.I. Makarov in Bazhenova, *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie*, 1, p.92-3. However, a confession of weakness marks most prayers and cannot be cited as a proof that the *Pokhvala* and the prayer were originally two unconnected works.
57 Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.83, fol.174-4v
58 Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.88, fol.180
the writer begins each clause with the pronoun ‘to you’: ‘ТВЕР ПРИПАДАЕМЫ, ТВЕР СА МИНИ ДРЕМЫ’.59 The writer’s use of pronouns in the parallel phrases ‘WT ТВЕР НА НАС’ and ‘WT НАС К ТВЕР’ heightens the contrast between God’s blessing and the people’s unrighteousness, ‘ЕСЕ ЕО ЕАВУ OE ТВЕР НАС, ЕСЕ ЖЕ НЕПРАВДЕНОE WT НАС K TBOE’.60 Another striking example of the interplay between personal pronouns is the juxtaposition of ‘НАМЪ ТВЕР’ in the confession, ‘Н РЕС СТРАЛАЩИИ И ПРЕЗАЩИ И НАСЪ, НО НАМЪ ТВЕР НЕ \_ДИСКАЩИИ’.61 Two dative absolutes are juxtaposed in such a way as to reveal the depth of God’s faithfulness compared with the ignominy of the people’s indifference. The adversative conjunction ‘но’ also intensifies the contrast. In general conjunctions such as ‘but’, ‘for’ and ‘if’ often redirect or sharpen a request, contributing to the overall sense of rhythm and dynamic in the people’s relationship with God.

Confession is made with the awareness that the people are a new, little flock that has been brought into relationship with God. They appeal to their frailty and the recentness of their commitment as reasons which should call forth God’s patient and merciful response to them. The tone of a prayer is generally judged on the extent to which the themes of confession and repentance are thought to predominate. A number of scholars, including Moldovan and Rozov, argue that the penitent tone of the prayer clashes with the joyful tone of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and must therefore have been written at another point.62 This argument, however, must be viewed with caution since by no means all scholars are agreed about the tone of the prayer. Mil’kov, for example, is struck by the prayer’s joyful

59 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196
60 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.197
61 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.197v
62 If the Slovo is imbued with the atmosphere of the Easter liturgy, then Rozov feels the prayer expresses a Lenten and penitent mood. See Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, pp.146-78. Moldovan echoes Rozov’s opinion that the content, tone, genre and addressee distinguish the prayer from the Slovo and the Pokhvala. He too posits that the works of the Synodal manuscript were stitched together subsequently by Ilarion. See Moldovan, ‘K voprosu’, p.156.
ring and the way it harmonizes with the *Slovo*.\footnote{B. Mil’kov, ‘Ilarion i drevne-russkaia mysł’ in Bazhenova, *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie*, 2, pp.8-40.} He is surprised by the writer’s sure confidence in God’s providence and the lack of emphasis on humility, tears and suffering as the path to salvation. Likewise he notes that judgement is hardly mentioned, suggesting that on the contrary, God is somehow blamed for man’s frailty and sinfulness. He interprets the remark, ‘нё трепліт наш есімство длажа хосі тьемя’, as a veiled threat to God.

Bazhenova also explains the depiction of man’s infirmity as a sign that man has no free will, and ultimately God is responsible for sin, since he has power to give life and death.\footnote{Bazhenova, *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie*, 1, p.91} While agreeing that the prayer shows a buoyant confidence in God’s mercy and a profound awareness of people’s frailty, I would argue that God is not held responsible for sin in view of the writer’s admission that their wrong deeds deserve God’s anger, ‘гнёзд місті, его же достоин есьь по ділохь нашымь’.\footnote{Rozov, ‘Sinodal’niy spisok’, pp.146-78. Rozov lists two other titles of the prayer which name Ilarion as the author. The title of the manuscript Rozov designates A reads: ‘Молітва пріпелевого стіда нашого Иларіона митрополита Російскаго в нашестві неплеменних и за бездѣліаніе и в смртномію и за всякое пріущеіе’, or indeed any other calamity which demanded repentance for sins. He rightly doubts, however, that Ilarion would have written the title himself.\footnote{See Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.128.} Besides which, in the prayer when they ask God not to

Scholars argue that the prayer was originally written at a time of specific need which called for confession, being joined at a later point to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. Müller suggests that the prayer was written ten to fifteen years earlier than the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* at a time of danger.\footnote{Müller suggests that the people’s plea ‘гнёзд місті, его же достоин есьь по ділохь нашымь’, was spoken at a time of particular danger. He acknowledges, however, that the prayer continues in a more general vein (‘Ilarion Werke’, p.16).} Rozov presumes that the prayer was occasioned by any one of the disasters listed in the title, ‘Молітва пріпелевого стіда нашого Иларіона митрополита Російскаго в нашестві неплеменних и за бездѣліаніе и в смртномію и за всякое пріущеіе’, or indeed any other calamity which demanded repentance for sins. He rightly doubts, however, that Ilarion would have written the title himself.\footnote{Muller suggests that the people’s plea ‘гнёзд місті, его же достоин есьь по ділохь нашымь’, was spoken at a time of particular danger. He acknowledges, however, that the prayer continues in a more general vein (‘Ilarion Werke’, p.16).} Besides which, in the prayer when they ask God not to
unleash hardships, famines, death, fire and flood, these requests appear to be more general in character and no one disaster is singled out. In three variant manuscripts more specific petitions are added so that the people intercede for the sick, and in manuscript T-224 intercession is made for the land to be fruitful and for the welfare of young and old. In prayer books, prayers written for times of drought or famine regularly interpret disaster more markedly as a result of God’s anger over sin. A characteristic plea in time of drought, found in an eighteenth-century manuscript, is, ‘чисти нынечь Господи греши наши и гнезду отречи и все нам спаси и наведи по правде и подаждь и нынечь дожди возды на земли’.

The writers of the Povest’ vremennykh let also interpret disasters as divine punishment. Punishment in this life is seen as the people’s due, a call to repentance so that they might be refined like gold and not be punished in the next life. The chronicler reasons that Rus’ is a favoured nation and therefore the punishment for sin is now more severe. In the prayer there is no hint that Rus’ should receive harsher treatment from God because of its favoured status. God’s anger in the prayer is depicted in relation to the present and the people do not dwell on the Day of Judgement. Whereas repentance is a key theme of the prayer, it is not linked to a concrete event.

The writer of the prayer is particularly conscious of the feebleness of the people’s faith and the frailty of their nature. In the Synodal manuscript the people petition God, ‘малы покази а много помиловь; малы ныь, а милостивь и целай; вместь оскочи, а въскочь въесели’. They ask God to remove temptation because of their weakness, ‘миниевди исхождения, бько льбить есмь и прахъ’. Literally the people ask God to ‘take past’ temptation, showing an

---

68 ‘Благая наука смилостивии’, variants A, B and C.
69 ‘Пад земли прыжки, младенца ездиты, стыдьсть падажды’ (Rozov, ‘Iz tvorchescogo naslediia’, p.135). Variant D also contains this reading.
70 Trebnik, M 1732, School of Slavonic and East European Studies (London), p.239v.
71 PVLL, col.167-70, s.a.1068.
72 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.198v
73 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196
even greater awareness of human frailty than the request from the Lord’s prayer used in the short prayer, ‘не каядь наш вое испытания’. In a further plea in the Synodal manuscript, the speaker beseeches God not to bring disaster so that those of faltering faith should not fall away, ‘А не внидай, чтоб невера не везде’. In manuscript T-224 the meaning is reversed and the assertion is made that those of faltering faith will not fall away, ‘не внидай невера’. Although later variants include ‘А не’, they attach it to a milder version of the sentiment, so that it is not a question of people falling away from faith but of the faint-hearted losing confidence in God’s mercy, ‘А не страшись малодушием и мицить тесей’. Later scribes may have found the idea of loss of faith too extreme for a country where Christianity was established, or perhaps they regarded it as something of a threat to God, opting instead for the gentler version of growing faint-hearted. Overall, the writer of the prayer of the Synodal manuscript expresses an exuberant confidence in God’s mercy which overshadows the weakness of human nature.

Confession is less Lenten in tone than Rozov suggests. Cries of faith and penitence intersperse the people’s confession. For example, before a long list of verbs of confession, the writer emphasizes how eagerly they seek God: ‘тебя ищем, тебя приводим, ты се мы отвергаем’. After confessing their sins, the people repent using the words: ‘кисимся, пресимся, молимся’. By inserting a determined response of penitence immediately before and after, confession is punctuated with hope. One of the sins listed is that of attachment to earthly things ‘земной жице к земнымъ преложимъ’. This confession indicates man’s earthbound nature rather than his wilful disobedience. After a second and longer confession, the

---

74 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.198v
75 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.134
76 Variants D, E and F.
77 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196
78 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196v
people are quick to affirm their belonging and faithfulness to God. They point to the fervour of their present response alongside past sin. This creates an arena for change and balance rather than a sculptured relief of man ever sinner and God ever judge.

The petitions in the prayer naturally reflect the society in which they were composed. In several manuscripts the writer prays that they will not experience internecine conflicts. Significantly, this plea occurs neither in the Synodal manuscript nor in the later variants of the long prayer, since at the time of Iaroslav I (as later under Muscovite hegemony) such a plea was unnecessary. Later readings also tend to embellish the names of intercessors, adding to their number and using additional epithets. For example, the prayer in the Synodal manuscript describes John the Baptist as 'предтеча троего и крестителя Ивана', while T-224 reads 'честного и славного пророка и предтеча троего Ивана'. Two variants of the long prayer expand on the list of fathers to include Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, John Chrysostom, St Nicholas and the Princes Vladimir, Boris and Gleb, as well as the founders of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Antonii and Feodosii. The last two names point to an epoch after Ilarion’s metropolitanate. The intercessions in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript are the least adorned and reflect the society of the eleventh century, both factors which indicate its early provenance.

Intercessions can also be indicative of a people’s perception of nationhood. It is a mark of the Emperor’s authority as God’s regent that throughout the Byzantine Empire he was to be mentioned in the prayers of all the countries which had converted to Orthodoxy. Even if he had no real

---

79 The people declare that they do not lift their hands to a foreign god, nor follow a false prophet, nor hold to heretical teaching, but rather they call on the true God, raise their eyes to heaven and lift their hands to God (Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.198).
80 T-224 and variants A, B and C.
81 Variants D, E and F.
82 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.199
83 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.136
84 Variants A and C
power in a country, this intercession at least would concede his formal authority. Likewise, in the *Zhitie Feodosii* Feodosii orders Iziaslav to be mentioned before Sviatoslav in the litany, even after the latter is ruling as prince of Kiev and Iziaslav is living in exile. By this act Feodosii recognizes Iziaslav as the rightful prince of Kiev. In the prayer of the Synodal manuscript the people intercede for the rulers (*kladnykh*), whereas in some other manuscripts of the long prayer people pray for the prince or their princes in the plural. Significantly, 'vladykie' is not a personal title but denotes more generally the function of ruling, which would not apply so specifically to the rulers of Rus', as the terms prince or kagan do. Given that intercession has already been made in the *Pokhvala* for kagan Larislav, the prayer's more general intercession for rulers (*kladnykh*) seems particularly appropriate here.

If Moldovan's interpretation of the opening words of the prayer is accepted, and 'cheml' *n* 'zig' is translated 'to these', Vladimir and Larislav would be seen to receive glory and honour for their labours. Thus at the

---

85 John A. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism*, North Carolina, 1982, pp.146-50, points out that even during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries when the Church of Rus' endorsed obedience to the Mongol rulers, it still reserved the supreme place in the liturgy for the Byzantine emperor.

86 The long prayer: S-591 'kladnykh'; T-224 'khand'; A, B, C 'kladny'; D 'kned'; E, F 'klaednykh kniedi'.

87 Müller objects that the petition in the *Pokhvala* and the prayer is too repetitive to have been originally part of a single work. The prayer, however, unlike the *Pokhvala* does not intercede specifically for the kagan ('Ilarion Werke', p.12). Paszkiewicz argues that the petition 'klaednykh kniedi nspi gr, imgr zlick, iednyom ograd' is earlier and more authentic than the one found in the Synodal manuscript, 'klaedny nspi wersi stramla'. The first reading appears to support his theory that the word 'iazyk' in early texts can refer to an eparchy. He argues that the people of Rus' were less belligerent than their later Muscovite counterparts and therefore they petitioned God to protect the prince by the eparchy (H. Paszkiewicz, *The Making of the Russian Nation*, London, 1963, pp.41-8). Seven manuscripts, however, retain the verb 'weomu', omitting the phrase 'imgr zick', which in any case points to a later date. Paszkiewicz overlooks the fact that 'klaednykh' indicates an earlier reading and that only the later manuscripts, in this study the seventeenth-century variants D and E, prefer 'zizzoom' to 'stramla'. Lastly, there are precedents in the Old Testament for such prayers.

88 Only the prayer in the Synodal manuscript begins with the phrase 'onm *n* zig'. Traditionally this has been translated as 'therefore', 'moreover', a suitable word to link the prayer to the *Pokhvala*. Moldovan argues, however, it be could be translated 'to these', since the Synodal manuscript contains a number of examples where the dative plural ends with a soft jer. He also doubts that a fifteenth-century editor would make such an amendment. If he did, then surely he argues, the editor would have added a hard jer (onm) and positioned the pronoun near the verb. See Moldovan, 'K voprosu', pp.151-6. By the end of the *Pokhvala* Larislav is seen to join the
opening of the prayer Vladimir, and potentially Iaroslav too, are seen as powerful intercessors on behalf of the people. In other manuscripts of the prayer, space is left for the prince to be named, so that in manuscript T-224 the editor includes the phrase 'ыпиножи мышельть теся на ряст трема, князем нашим иста гек'. Similarly in T-254, Rozov’s principal manuscript for the short prayer, a space is left for the individual names of the prince and the archbishop. In later manuscripts, room is left for the names of the tsar, the grand prince, the tsaritsa, the princess and their children and the Patriarch of Moscow. Alterations made to the titles of secular and ecclesiastical authorities reflect the changing political climate and reveal a society which increasingly recognized different strata.

While manuscripts of the short prayer include intercession for the tsar and his family, or for the prince and the archbishop, none of the manuscripts of the long prayer, even those from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, record intercession for the tsar and the archbishop. In this respect, it is worth noting that only the short prayer occurs in the New Year’s service, in which intercession plays an important part, in particular intercession made on behalf of the tsar and the ecclesiastical heavenly company through the efficacy of Vladimir’s prayers and his own labours. This corresponds with the opening of the prayer, which pictures God as exalted and glorious, rewarding the princes for their labour in heaven.

89 If 'ииможже еже еси' is not seen to refer to the princes, the beginning of the prayer can be easily adapted. For example, the writer of T-224 employs the pronominal present participle 'the one who gives' and re-positions the pronoun 'us', so that the prayer obviously addresses the suppliants rather than the princes, 'вельялин пгтии тиадам слад и честь, причастники ны сестры своего царства' (Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', p.128).

90 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', p.135

91 The short prayer: T-254, B 'кнада'; A, D 'цар'; C 'цар и великого кнада', F 'цар и великаго кнада и благоувиру и христианскую царну и великую кандину, имл ряс, и изъ благородныя чала: благородный царнина, имл ряс, и благородную царну и великую кандину, имл ряс... пинаки великаго градини осветяшы, имл ряс, патриарда московскаго и княт Руси, и княя привильств, призванышыхъ мирцамитъ и друхимеизми и ипикеи вписованныхъ', (G is nearly identical).

92 Rozov suggests that the reference to the prince and archbishop in the earlier manuscripts of the short prayer, combined with the Novgorodian origin of three of the six manuscripts he uses, indicates the Novgorodian provenance of the short prayer. By contrast manuscripts of the long prayer are of Muscovite origin, and, significantly, even in the later manuscripts intercessions do not include the tsar or tsaritsa. He cites this as evidence for the earlier origin of the long prayer (N.N. Rozov, 'Rukopisnaia traditsiia “Slova o zakone i blagodati”', TOLI, 17, 1961, p.50).
hierarchy. With a shorter penitential section than the long prayer and an increased number of intercessions, the short prayer is better suited for the New Year’s office. In addition, one of its petitions ‘АКТО МИТРОНО МИРЕБ АРГУ’, make it directly relevant to the New Year’s service.93

The fact that the long prayer was similar to one used at New Year did not miss the eye of the fifteenth-century scribe of the Synodal manuscript, who scribbled a note in the margin, ‘И на левопробождение са молитва тош, и подсена’. Gorski also comments on the coincidence of a prayer which is read at New Year entitled ‘молитва ко Господу нашему Исусу Христу за ЦАРС И за всЯ ХРЯСТЯНСЫ’, identifying it with the prayer that Archbishop Guri said in 1555 in the newly conquered area of Kazan’. The prayer is described as ‘тезовни Митрополита Илария Русского за ЦАРС И за вс я Православие’. He assumes that it must be the same prayer as found in the Synodal manuscript, and cites this reference to Ilarion’s prayer as evidence for his authorship of both the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and the prayer.94

Zhdanov, refuting Ilarion’s authorship of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript and the Slovo o zakone i blagodati, suggests that the editor found the closing petition to Vladimir inadequate, and added a prayer possibly known to him from the New Year’s service. Here, he conjectures, the similarity of the opening words with those at the end of the Pokhvala and the nature of a prayer entitled ‘за ЦАРС И за всЯ ХРИСТЯНСЫ’ made it fitting. Reversing Zhdanov’s assumption that the long prayer was taken from the New Year’s service, I suggest on the contrary, that Ilarion’s prayer may have been adapted for the service at a later point. This remains only a suggestion, as the link between the short prayer and the New Year’s service must first be investigated more thoroughly.

93 In one seventeenth-century New Year’s office the short prayer is prefaced by the note, ‘АКТО АЗ ВИНИТ И ОНЯ АЗ ГЛАГОЛЯ МИРТЕГ 2-О ГОДОВУ ИЧТУ’ (Nikol’skii, ‘Chin letoprovodstva’, p.155).
94 Partly on this basis he assumes that Ilarion is author of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati. He also points to similar expressions common to the confession of faith and the Slovo, as well as the artistic skill which characterizes both the Slovo and the prayer (Gorskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, pp.213-4).
The editor’s note in the Synodal manuscript correctly observes that the long prayer resembles the short one but is not identical to it. The mention of intercession for the tsar in the title ‘за Царя и за вся христианы’ naturally points to a period after the eleventh century. It is also important not to miss the connection between the title of the prayer and the occasion on which Archbishop Gurii was instructed to say it. The title tsar was one adopted by Ivan IV a few years earlier, and the occasion was the conquest of Kazan'. Intercessions made for the tsar in this newly conquered territory would help to reinforce his authority. While one cannot be certain that Gurii recited the words of Ilarion’s prayer, its title contrasts with the prayer of the Synodal manuscript which simply reads ‘вс за землю нашу’. Thus the title of the prayer which Archbishop Gurii was given to pronounce focuses more on one person who exercises authority over his kingdom (tsarstvo), while the title of the long prayer emphasizes its role as a united response from the whole land.

A unifying theme of the Slovo, the Pokhvala and the prayer is the idea that the new relationship with God is for the whole land and for all people, regardless of age and status. The Slovo illustrates how God pours out his grace on the whole earth, and concludes with a number of prophecies exhorting all people to praise God, ‘и Царе земли и князям, князя и царь, князей и княгинь, и всь людей, да хвалить имя Господа’. Vladimir too emphasizes that his command to be baptized is for all the people, ‘мужем и женем, рабам и свободным, земля и городам, боярам и простым, богатым и бедным’. Intercession in the prayer is made firstly for the people in general (предложи милость твою на людей твоих) and then for peace, for the rulers, the boiars, the towns, the Church and once again for the people (мужи и жены и малымъ враги). This order is in

---

95 Moldovan, Slovo, p.91, fol.184
96 Moldovan, Slovo, p.93, fol.186v. The Synodal manuscript alone mentions the boiars and the simple folk. All other redactions omit these categories.
97 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.198y-9
keeping with Chrysostom’s recommendation that prayer be made first for the people and then for rulers. By contrast, the scribe of manuscript T-224 specifies the prince and the boiars before a general prayer for the people, ‘Умноси миленъ твою на всѣ твои царь и царица, и на всѣхъ князей и бояръ, и на всѣхъ адѣлъ твоих’.

Since a second petition for the prince and boiars is repeated shortly afterwards, it suggests that the earlier intercession was inserted deliberately so that the prince and boiars would take precedence. A prayer taken from the seventeenth-century New Year’s office presents the same hierarchical ordering of the intercessions with the tsar taking first place, then the Church, and lastly the town and all the people, ‘цѣлый и сохрани въ мирѣ, всѣго царя, церкви, и города, и всѣ люди твои, многомилостивый’.

The first place given to the people in the intercession of the long prayer fits its overall focus on a united people. Likewise in the Pokhvala, Vladimir is asked to intercede first for land and people, and then for the kagan Iaroslav: ‘помолись о землѣ своемъ и всѣхъ адѣлъ... паче же помолись о своихъ твоихъ, благосердымъ каганѣ нашемъ Георгію’.

In the long prayer intercession is made for the Church which is perceived as a single inheritance, a corporate body of men, women and children: ‘церкви твоему возрасти, достойне свое сбѣлдамъ, мѣждо, жены и младенцы спаси’.

Intercession for ‘your Church’ in the singular, rather than for

98 P. Schaff (ed.), Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, XIII, Michigan, 1956, p.426. This excerpt is drawn from one of his homilies on the First Letter to Timothy based on the text, ‘I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men: for kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty’.

99 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo nasledia’, p.135

100 Nikol’skii, ‘Chin letoprovodstva’, p.148. Taken from the 1646 prayerbook of metropolitan Peter Mogila. In other examples, the order of intercessions depends on the position of the writer. For example, in a prayer for Saturday Matins Kirill of Turov intercedes first for himself and the community, second for people of ecclesiastical rank, third for Orthodox tsars and princes, fourthly for those who support their monastery and last for all Christians. See Kirill von Turov. Gebete. Nach der Ausgabe in Pravoslavnyi sobesednik 1858, repr. D. Tschizewskij (ed.), (Slavische Propylaen 6), Munich, 1965, (hereafter Gebete), p.334.

101 Moldovan, Slovo, fol.194v-5

102 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.199
churches in the plural ‘церкви едина’ (manuscript T-224), conveys better the idea of the Church and the people as a united identity rather than a stratified one. Likewise by praying for the Church as a whole, the long prayer does not name ecclesiastical offices which would later obscure the vision of the Church foremost as a united people.

After petitions for those in difficult circumstances, the speaker intercedes for everyone: ‘єй помилуй, єй дивізії, єй відради, радьсть твора ним і теляць і душеньку’.

Mercy, comfort and joy are the keynotes. The heavenly hosts, the Virgin, John the Baptist, the apostles, prophets, martyrs, and saints, are seen to intercede for those on earth. The people pray that they may be pastured in oneness of faith, ‘всеми в едненьї вѣры’, an image which recalls the beginning of the prayer. Here Jesus is invoked as the good shepherd who has laid down his life for the sheep, sheep who may stray, but nevertheless comprise the small flock to whom Jesus promises the heavenly kingdom. The image of a flock of sheep possesses both Biblical resonance and strengthens the sense of common identity and oneness. Unity and joy are also expressed in the people’s praise of God, ‘єхвіляє, восход и радостно славимъ та’. This final note of celebration echoes the concluding scene of the Slovo, which pictures God enthroned over the whole earth and its people caught up in praise of him, ‘єхвіляются и вистаряється вазени, и епі пазени єхвіляютє руками и вєхвіляютє Бога власимъ радості’.

Ultimate unity is glimpsed in the nature of the Trinity, indivisibly one, ruling over and uniting the heavens and the earth, angels and mankind, the visible and invisible creation, ‘трійця нераздельна, едіноєдненна, царствуючи на небесах і на землі, ангеломъ и человекомъ, видимым и невидимымъ твари’. The Trinity is also the theme of Ilarion’s next work, his confession of faith – ‘єдино в едино Бога’. Thus unity is seen to lie at the heart of the Slovo o

---

103 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.199
104 Moldovan, Slovo, pp.90-1, fol.183v
105 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.199v
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zakone i blagodati as grace reaches the whole world, imbuing the prayer
with the message of a unified people united in God. In this way the prayer
is seen to be integral to the new identity of Rus’.

By contrast, several signs indicate that the short prayer is spoken by
a nation no longer on the brink of forming a new Christian identity, but
rather by one with some generations of Christian tradition behind it. For
example, instead of petitioning God to continue to show mercy on his
people, ‘ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΗ ΜΙΛΑΣΤΗ ΤΕΟΥ ΝΑ ΑΡΩΜΑ ΤΡΟΙΧΑ’, the short prayer recalls God’s
former mercy, ‘ΑΝΤΙΕΞΙΝ ΠΑΣΧΑΝΟΜΑΝ ΜΙΛΑΣΤΗ ΤΡΟΙΧΑ ΠΕΡΕΙΛΗ’. This suggests an
awareness of time passing rather than the cry of a people recently
converted. The short prayer also shows less concern for the people as a
Corporate identity. As has been noted already, more space is devoted to
intercessions for the secular and spiritual rulers of Rus’. An additional
pointer to the passing of time is evident in the intercession made for those
who have died, first for kings and princes and archbishops, second for
bishops and those of priestly and monastic rank, and last for all Christians
who have pleased God. By the time Ilarion wrote the Slovo o zakone i
blagodati, only in Ol’ga’s and Vladimir’s generations had rulers died as
Orthodox believers. By contrast, the long prayer concentrates on the living
rather than on the departed, ending on a more exuberant tone of joy, unity
and praise.

In conclusion, while it cannot be proved that Ilarion wrote the prayer
attached to the end of Slovo o zakone i blagodati, it can be shown to fit well
into its literary setting. The evidence comes not from the overall shape of
the work, or even the occasion for which it was composed, but rather from
the thematic and linguistic linking between the prayer and the Slovo o
zakone i blagodati. From a linguistic angle, the prayer of the Synodal

---

107 Rozov’s earliest manuscript of the short prayer T-254, makes intercession first for the prince
and second for the archbishop, and then for members of the various clerical, priestly or monastic
ranks.
manuscript and the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* reflect a similarly archaic level of language. Compared with other manuscripts, the prayer also seems to preserve more faithfully the triadic and paired patterning of sentences, as well as intercessions which fit its earlier dating.

The prayer’s title ‘from our whole land’ is seen to be indicative of Ilarion’s national vision. In the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer Ilarion builds an identity on the concept of the ‘ruskaia zemlia’ which is able to bond people into a common identity regardless of tribal or social divisions. The prayer also reflects the idea that God’s blessing is manifest in belonging to a land, and his punishment in exile from their land. Alongside the concept of the ‘ruskaia zemlia’ the prayer develops the *Slovo’s* use of the term people ‘liudie’, signifying those who belong to God. Images which describe the people as a flock or an inheritance also contribute to the projection of a single identity.

The prayer’s emphasis on the whole people is more striking when compared with the short prayer. Here the intercessions are seen indirectly to reinforce positions of authority in society, both secular and sacred. By an expanded number of intercessions as well as other additions, the short prayer is particularly suited to its placing in the New Year’s service. Intercessions for the departed reflect a national awareness of generations of Christian rulers, clerics and people who have died. By contrast the long prayer focusses more on the present in which the people see themselves as a new and little flock under God’s care. They express both their inexperience and frailty as well as their confidence in God’s mercy and forgiveness. Even the language reflects the impression of a young and dynamic relationship rather than a long-established and sculptured pattern of behaviour. The long prayer ends on a note of joy and unity, which underlies the people’s new identity. If the *Slovo* explains how the land of Rus’ is incorporated into the Christian community, and the *Pokhvala* hymns the mortal instrument of
Unity in the prayer attributed to Ilarion

‘Ψυχαγ γρηγορια ζημαλα σταλε κετ’’ - a phrase which forms part of the title of the *Povest’ vremennykh let*, also makes an appropriate title for Ilarion’s work *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* which is followed by a prayer. Ilarion, who was writing probably as a third generation Christian since his country’s official conversion, and also as the first native candidate to be selected as Metropolitan, shows great concern to establish the identity of Rus’ as a Christian nation. In contrast to pre-Christian days, when the area known as Rus’ was inhabited, according to the chronicler, by different tribes who lived completely different lifestyles, Rus’ now was to have an ideology which could fashion a single identity.¹

What united the people of Rus’? The chronicler answers this question by first tracing their literal descent to Noah’s son Japheth. Ilarion can be seen to answer this question with a sermon, a eulogy and a prayer. In order to focus first on Ilarion’s perception of Rus’ as a land inhabited now by God’s people, I have worked from the assumption that the prayer is linked to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. The ordering of sermon, eulogy, and prayer is found in only one fifteenth-century Synodal manuscript. After the prayer follow two confessions of faith, and a colophon. This last entry informs the reader that Ilarion, a monk and presbyter, was enthroned

¹ After describing the practices of the Slav tribes, especially with regard to their different marriage customs, the chronicler concludes that Christians in all lands who believe in the Trinity, in one baptism, in one faith, all have one law inasmuch as they are baptized into Christ and clothed with him (*PVL*, col.16). Here the chronicler emphasizes that the Christian faith is an important unifying factor. A. Poppe, ‘Christianity and ideological change in Kievan Rus’: the first hundred years’, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 25, 1992, p.6, voices a widely held view that a major factor in the conversion of Rus’ was the search for ‘a comprehensive system of beliefs and views that would on the one hand consolidate the ruling class, while on the other help to broaden and deepen the ties between society as a whole and the political organisation of the young, constantly growing state’. 
Metropolitan in Kiev by the bishops in the year 1051 during the reign of Prince Iaroslav. Working from this information, it is generally inferred that Ilarion was the author of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. I will return to the question of whether the prayer belongs to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* later.

In the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer Ilarion uses the word ‘land’ (*zemlia*) to describe both the country and the people of Rus’ as a single identity. The relationship between the people and the land is underlined by phrases such as ‘our land’, or with reference to the rulers Vladimir I and Iaroslav I, ‘his land’ and ‘your land’. The phrase ‘*Р и А И А ИА И*’ appears to be reserved for striking moments of unity which affect all the people. For example, when grace reaches Rus’ it waters our whole land, ‘*Р И А И А ИА И*’. After the people have been baptized, our whole land praises God, ‘*Р И А И А ИА И*’. Significantly, the phrase ‘our whole land’ is found in the title of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript, the only manuscript which unites the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* with the prayer – ‘*М И П Р И Б И Т Е И*’. Contrary to the opinion that this title has been tagged on by a later

---

2 The information in the colophon is corroborated by the entry in the *PVLL* s.a.1051 (*PVLL*, col. 155-6). This entry also notes that Ilarion served as priest in the church at Berestovo, a place favoured by Iaroslav, and that he prayed regularly in a cave which was to be the site of the future Kievan Caves Monastery. A similar passage is incorporated in the *Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik* (*KPP*, pp.16-7).

3 The colophon describes Iaroslav as ‘kagan’, a title which is also used in the *Pokhvala* of the Synodal manuscript, further indicating their common authorship.

4 The only other country to be honoured with the title ‘*zemlia*’ rather than ‘*strana*’ is the Byzantine Empire. Müller’s hypothesis here is a reasonable one. He suggests that Rus’ had strong ties with Byzantium in the fields of religion and culture and therefore was hardly regarded as an alien land. See L. Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’, *Forum Slavicum*, 37, 1971, (hereafter Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’), p.74.

5 I shall refer to Ilarion’s sermon and eulogy as the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* or the *Slovo*. Where I differentiate between the separate works, I shall use the terms the *Slovo*, the *Pokhvala* and the prayer. For the text of the *Slovo* and *Pokhvala* I shall use A. Moldovan’s edition, *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, Kiev, 1984 (hereafter Moldovan, *Slovo*), and for the text of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript I shall use N.N. Rozov’s study in ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok sochinenii Ilariona russkogo pisatel’ia XI veka’, *Slavia*, 32, 1963, pp.141-75 (hereafter Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’). The texts of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer as cited above, are based on a fifteenth-century manuscript, Sin. no.591, GIM.
editor, the phrase, ‘\( \text{слово всем земле нации} \)', is integral to an understanding of the prayer as a reflection of the new Christian identity of Rus', a cry of the whole country to God. Like the title of the *Slovo* and the *Pokhvala* which is noted for its accuracy, the title of the prayer also appears to accurately signal the intent of the prayer.\(^6\)

Ilarion, however, does not argue for the unity of Rus' on the basis of one word. At the heart of his sermon, unity is seen to reach its fulfillment through Christ’s mission. He expounds the unity of the Old and New Testaments by criss-crossing the story of Abraham and the giving of the law, with the coming of Jesus and the revelation of grace. At the culminating point of both Testaments, Christ is seen to unite the earthly and heavenly, ‘\( \text{Связана на земле и небесы и земные, сокрушая в едино ангель и человекы} \).’\(^7\) Now the law is seen to be restricted no longer to one place and one people, but grace radiates from Jerusalem to cover the whole earth, including Rus'. Ilarion emphasizes that grace is for all people, and throughout his sermon the refrain ‘\( \text{по всем земле} \)’ rings out. Thus the land of Rus’ is seen firstly in the larger context of universal unity, which is foremost a spiritual unity that looks forward to the ultimate uniting of the heavenly and the earthly.

With specific reference to Rus’, the *Pokhvala* celebrates Vladimir and then Jaroslav as rulers who help to establish spiritual unity in a concrete way. Significantly, the baptism of Rus’, the crown of Vladimir’s achievement, is depicted as taking place at one time and with a common will. Vladimir and Jaroslav, the focus of authority in Rus’, are set apart by their title ‘kagan’, a title which suggests their sovereign status more

---

\(^6\) The full title of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* reads: ‘\( \text{О законе Моисеевом данному, и в благодарении и истине Иисуса Христа бывшем, и в благодарении и истине Бога и Его Иисуса Христа, и в единою истиною, и в единою верою и единою церковь, и в единою иконами в святых и в единою верою в Единого, Есуса Христа, и в единою святостью и в единою мощию.} \) (Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.78, fol.168). Any early title is open to the charge of being added to, or subtracted from, and therefore additional reasons will be cited below for presuming that the works were originally linked together.

\(^7\) Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.81, fol.171v-2
forcefully than the pedestrian 'kniaz'' used by the chronicler. If Ilarion employs the title 'kagan' with such care as has been suggested by scholars, then it comes as no surprise that in the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and in the prayer, he should also develop the use of other words to help to create a united identity for the land and the people of Rus'.

In addition to the term 'ruskaia zemlia', Ilarion also attaches special significance to the noun 'liudie'. In a Biblical context the word 'people' generally refers to those who belong to God as his people. In the *Slovo* Ilarion elucidates how God opens the way so that all nations can become his people, a privilege reserved in the past for the Hebrew people. Thus the prophetic words cited in the *Slovo*, 'и РЖЯ тЕЙЬМ МОЯМ, АДЯЕ МОЙ,' are seen also to apply to Rus'. Three times in the prayer the people ask for mercy, reminding God that they are his people. In two instances the cry 'we are your people' is followed by two descriptions of the people which underscore a collective and united identity, first as a flock of sheep (мы бо

and second as an inheritance (мы АДЯЕ ТЕВ, ТЕБ ЧАСТЬ, ТЕСЕ ДОСТОЯНИЕ). These collective

---

8 For literature on the title 'kagan' see *inter alia*: 1) A. Poppe, 'Christianity and ideological change in Kievian Rus': the first hundred years', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 25, 1992, p.9, notes that 'kniaž' is the Slavonic translation of the usual Greek word for ruler 'archon'. He argues that Ilarion's use of the title 'kagan' lends Princes Vladimir and Jaroslav rank which does not directly challenge the Greek hierarchy but nevertheless commands respect and honour. On the other hand he suggests, the title 'kniaž' would sound lame. 2) W. Vodoff, 'La titulature des princes russes du Xe s. au début du XIIe s. et les relations extérieures de la Russie Kiévienne', *Revue des études slaves*, 55, 1983, pp.139-50, observes that early bookmen used 'kniaž' to denote the sovereigns of Kiev and the other princes, reckoning that it eclipsed other titles such as kagan by the end of the eleventh century. He comments on the apparent 'indifference' toward titles felt by rulers. 3) J. Arrignon, 'Remarques sur le titre de kagan attribué aux princes russes d'après les sources occidentales et russes des IXe-XIIe s.', *Recueil des travaux de l'Institut d'études byzantines*, 23, 1984, pp.63-71, suggests that 'kagan' is a 'vacant' title from the days of the Khazarian kaganate, which signifies both political sovereignty and dynastic legitimacy without ruffling Byzantine feathers. 4) A. Novosel'tsev, 'K voprosu ob odnom iz drevneishikh titulov russkogo kniazia', *Istoriia SSSR*, 4, 1982, pp.150-9, investigates the historical context of the word 'kagan' and links it to events occurring in Ilarion's lifetime. My study concentrates on the way Ilarion uses certain words and creates an identity around them, rather than on investigating the origins of a word, or the coining of new words.

9 Moldovan, *Slovo*, pp.89-90, fol.182

10 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.171, fol.195v

11 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.172, fol.198
expressions reinforce Ilarion’s attempt to form a corporate identity for ‘our whole land’.

‘Land and people’ are shown to ring out like a slogan, conveying two essential criteria for national self-definition. In the Old Testament the people of Israel were seen to be God’s people, whose belonging to God and identity as his people, was bound up with their land. Exile from their land was seen as punishment and alienation from God. According to a similar principle, the prayer interprets the people’s belonging to their land as a sign of God’s blessing. Conversely, the threat of being a people without a land, exiled and dispossessed, is regarded as a severe punishment. These images of exile and disinheritance provide the finale for two sections of confession in the prayer. In the first section placed at the beginning of the prayer, the people see themselves potentially as outcasts and fugitives (въгры) from their Lord. In the second section, the people recall the desolation of Jerusalem and ask God not to bring on them the same fate, ‘не сътвори намъ и въгры, по дабомъ нашимъ’. The contiguous dative plural pronouns ‘намъ и въгры’ underline the parallel. Likewise, two dative present participles describing the people’s sin, ‘намъ теме не къзискахвашем’ and ‘чадимых сихъ прислушаващих’, parallel two dative past participles, depicting the sin of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, ‘чистаквашимъ та’ and ‘не ходимымъ въ гети тов’. The writer indicates that the land of Rus’ and the Jewish homeland may share a common destiny of disinheritance, unless Rus’ repents. This possible punishment echoes the depiction in the Slovo of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem as he foresees the result of their rejection of him - its destruction. Ilarion remarks on the fate of the Jews in the Slovo by noting that they were scattered among different countries in fulfilment of Christ’s prophecy. In Ilarion’s prayer a further petition implores God to safeguard their city so that they will not be aliens in a land which is not

---

12 ‘Идяще сътвори теме, и земля не сътвори намъ и въгры, и ходимъ съ нами въ пяти тов’. (Moldovan, Slovo, p.87, fol.179).
their own: ΓΔΔΗΗΕΗΕΗΓΔΔΗΔ ΗΓΔΔΗΗΕΗΕΗГΔΔΗΗΓΔΔΗΔ ΓΔΔΗΗΕΗΕΗГΔΔΗΗГΔΔΗΔ ΓΔΔΗΗΕΗΕΗГΔΔΗΗГΔΔΗΔ.

Implicit in the negative description of ζελανα ηεςεδα is the positive idea of a country which is their own, a country which can be called ‘our land’. 14

Rather than define Rus’ negatively, in terms of what it is not, Ilarion chooses positive definition. By contrast to the Povest’ vremennyykh let, Ilarion’s eulogy does not portray Vladimir as a pagan who became a saint, but depicts him as an intelligent and just ruler who is enlightened by God. Likewise, the people of Rus’ are not called pagans before their conversion. 15 Images such as idolatrous dusk or parched land are employed to describe pre-Christian Rus’ in the Slovo, indicating a process of enlightenment and watering. Such imagery points to a natural state destined to be changed rather than condemning people for not having worshipped God previously.

Returning to the question of whether Ilarion is indeed the author of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and the prayer, evidence does not stop at the colophon with its note of his enthronement as Metropolitan. Another point

13 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.198v
14 Müller explains Ilarion’s use of ‘liudie’ in the Slovo o zakone i blagodati by reference to the translation of the Septuagint. He suggests that its translators described God’s holy and chosen people as ‘laos’, and the surrounding nations as ‘ethnos’, a distinction which is preserved in Ilarion’s work by the use of ‘liudie’ and ‘iazyk’ respectively. Furthermore, he observes that while ‘liudie’, is used primarily for the people of Rus’, ‘zemlia’ is reserved to describe Rus’ and its people, or the Greek land. Other nations are designated by the terms ‘strana’, ‘iazyk’ or ‘narod’ (Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’, pp.61-79). By contrast the Povest’ vremennyykh let does not appear to differentiate between ‘zemlia’ and ‘strana’. For example, Vladimir uses the word ‘zemlia’ when he asks the Jewish emissaries the whereabouts of their country, ‘я&nbsp;&nbsp;знамено ли&nbsp;&nbsp;землю&nbsp;&nbsp;свою?’. When they reply that their country (земля Иаиа) has been given to the Christians, Vladimir questions why, if God was pleased with their religion, did he scatter them among foreign lands, once again using the word ‘zemlia’ - ‘и&nbsp;&nbsp;в том&nbsp;&nbsp;земли&nbsp;&nbsp;ему&nbsp;&nbsp;дать’ (PVL, col.85-6). Although I doubt that the words ‘zemlia’, ‘strana’, ‘iazyk’ and ‘liudie’ are used as schematically as Müller suggests, nonetheless ‘zemlia’ and ‘liudie’ are central to Ilarion’s creation of an identity for Rus’, not just in the Slovo and Pokhvala, but also in the prayer.
15 In the prayer even other people are called foreigners (чужие) rather than pagans. One exception is the principal manuscript which Rozov uses for the prayer (T-224), according to which the people pray, ‘не прикасайся нас в руки паганъ... да не ржать паганъ; глаголет быть мнъ’. See N.N. Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia russkogo pisatelya XI veka Ilariona’, Acta Universitatis Szegedensis de Attila József. Dissertationes Slavicae, 9/10, 1975, (hereafter Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’), p.134.
in favour of Ilarion’s authorship is the unity of thought that characterizes the works in the Synodal manuscript. Rozov describes the overarching theme as patriotic, ‘love for one’s country’, while Müller sees it in the context of the calling of the nations to faith and the conversion of Rus’. Toporov interprets the work as enacting a three part ritual expressed in a triad of genres, a sermon, a eulogy and a prayer. Thematically, he discerns three periods - the kingdom of law under Moses, the kingdom of grace marking the beginning of Christianity, and thirdly the entry of Rus’ into the kingdom of grace. Time, Toporov observes, begins in the distant past and increasingly approaches the present until it culminates in the present time and space of the prayer. While acknowledging the interlinking of the three works, Toporov assumes that the Slovo and the Pokhvala were conceived together, with the prayer as a separate work. Moldovan’s views are similar, and he comments on the overarching idea in the works of the Synodal manuscript, describing them as its own kind of trilogy. In his recent essay on the Slovo o zakone i blagodati Simon Franklin reviews the arguments, proposing that it should be regarded as a single composition, with the three separable parts discussed as a ‘trinity’. While I agree with the general thrust of these views, I shall pause to consider additional textual

---

16 Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’, p.16
17 V. Toporov, ‘Rabotniki odinnadtsatogo chasa - “Slovo o zakone i blagodati” i drevnerusskie realii’, Russian Literature, 24, 1988, 1, pp.39-40, examines how clusters of words link the transitions between the Pokhvala, the Slovo and the prayer. He highlights three groups of words at the end of Slovo which sound the keynote for the Pokhvala: first words of praise and descriptions of the people and country; second expressions of enthusiasm, and third words which signify collectivity. He traces a similar pattern at the end of the Pokhvala, which forms a prelude to the prayer. He lists these word groups as, first, ‘khvala’, ‘slava’, ‘poklonenie’, ‘zemlia’, ‘strana', ‘iazyki’, ‘liudi’; second, ‘pet’, ‘veselit’sia’, ‘radovat’ria’, ‘voskliatsat’’, ‘pleskat’ rukami’; and third, ‘ves’, ‘vsiakii’.
19 Simon Franklin (tr. & intro.), Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus’, (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations V), Cambridge, Mass., 1991, xxvii-viii, cites in support of his view the logical and thematic progression which unites the works. He also comments on the unreliability of assuming that certain combinations of genres and length must determine the shape of the work. In addition, he points to the opening words of the prayer which support its linking with the Slovo o zakone i blagodati.
arguments which point to Ilarion’s authorship of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer.

It must be remembered that only the Synodal manuscript links the *Slovo*, the *Pokhvala* and the prayer, while in all other known manuscripts the prayer occurs independently from either the *Slovo* or the *Pokhvala*. This begs the question of whether the prayer was originally an integral part of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* or added later. Superficially, Ilarion’s works are not indicated clearly as his own in the Synodal manuscript. Although all the works are written by the same hand, no mark or new line separates the end of the prayer from the beginning of the confession of faith. This contrasts with the prayer which is marked by a separate heading ‘molitva’ and begins with an uppercase letter which straddles three lines. Only the beginning of the *Slovo* is comparable with the first letter of the opening word ‘blagosloven’ which spans the height of four lines. However, as Gorskii observes, in *vitae* prayers are often indicated by a cinnabar title and therefore a distinctive title marking the prayer is not exceptional. Whether the uppercase letters or the lack of marking for the confession of faith is due to scribal oversight or deliberate decision, is difficult to determine. Clearly, the question of the shape of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* cannot be judged exclusively on this basis.

Rather than rehearse all the arguments for and against the linking of the prayer with the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, I shall concentrate on those which have the most bearing on the text of the prayer. While it is
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23 Rozov also comments on these markings, noting that the end of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* is finished with a special mark that is not found again in the cycle of works attributed to Ilarion. He also points to a large initial letter ‘α’ on fol.169v which is distinctive but appears unmotivated (Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, pp.145-6).
24 Gorskii argues in favour of Ilarion’s authorship of the prayer and its connection to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, pointing to the internal coherence of the work evident in 1) the customary
impossible to prove either that Iliarion is the author of the prayer or that the prayer is integral to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, nevertheless the prayer can be shown to originate from the early period after the conversion of Rus’.

A full critical edition of the prayer is still lacking. On the basis of twelve manuscripts, Rozov identifies two redactions: the long prayer, reflected in the Synodal manuscript, and the short prayer, in which the second half of the prayer is significantly altered.\(^25\) In addition to the Synodal manuscript, I shall be using Rozov’s study and three other manuscripts.\(^26\)

First the prayer will be considered in its setting of the fifteenth-century Synodal manuscript. Following the results of Moldovan’s study of the *Slovo* and the *Pokhvala*, which led him to conclude that the Synodal manuscript is distinguished by an archaic level of language, notwithstanding its later date and overlay of features normally associated with the so-called glorification of the Trinity at the end of a work which is fulfilled by the prayer. 2) the closing idea of the *Pokhvala* is continued in the opening words of the prayer. 3) the prayer is mentioned in the title. 4) references which depict the Church as new or small reflect Iaroslav’s era. See Gorskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, pp.211-12. Although 1) is untenable since it is impossible to be certain of the shape of the original work, the other three points are reinforced by this study, including 3), which is generally rejected since titles are notoriously unreliable.

\(^25\) Rozov comments that only the nomocanons and pre-revolutionary catalogues list the prayer under Iliarion’s name, which makes it difficult to locate in manuscripts. Two principles guide his choice of manuscripts: first, he selects for his principal text the earliest manuscript, and second he chooses unpublished manuscripts. Citing Rozov’s bibliographical details, his principal manuscript for the long prayer is in a sluzhebnik s trebnikom, 1474, Tr.-Serg. no.224, RGB, fol.334-7 (hereafter T-224). For details of the variant manuscripts which Rozov uses for the long prayer see ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, pp.124-5 (I have anglicized the letters which signify the manuscripts A, B etc.). Rozov’s principal manuscript for the short prayer is a kanonnik, 14th century, Tr.-Serg. no.254, RGB, fol.53-6, (hereafter T-254). For variants of the short prayer see ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, pp.126-7. Rozov reproduces the original orthography for his principal manuscripts but not for the variants, see ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, pp.141-75.

Second South Slavonic influence, the same conclusion can be drawn regarding the prayer. The archaic features of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript stand out even more clearly when compared with manuscripts T-224 and T-254, the earliest manuscripts of the long and short prayer which Rozov uses. Second, a comparison of stylistic patterning will be made between the prayer of the Synodal manuscript and other manuscripts of the prayer under consideration.

With regard to the archaic level of language, Moldovan comments on the orthographical features of the *Slovo* and *Pokhvala* in the Synodal manuscript. He notes that comparatively few words are abbreviated, and when they are, it is in a random fashion which characterizes eleventh-century rather than fifteenth-century manuscripts. Likewise in the prayer 'milost', a commonly abbreviated word, in the Synodal manuscript is written out in three out of five instances. In Rozov's principal manuscripts 'milost' is abbreviated consistently. A similar picture can be painted of the abbreviations 'EAPV' used as a prefix and 'EAPV' where abbreviation in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript is less radical compared with other manuscripts. Another example occurs in the Synodal manuscript's description of the Trinity as 'EAMM', abbreviated in T-224 as 'EAMM'.

Admittedly, it is difficult to determine the extent of the so-called Second South Slavonic influence. Moldovan identifies typical South Slav features in the *Slovo* as the double gamma in the word 'ATPA', the unjoticized 'a' in place of 'a' or 'a', and the dative singular of o-stems ending in 'x' (with the 'x' also appearing in word roots and endings). The prayer also exhibits these features. It is less clear whether the mixture of
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27 Moldovan, *Slovo*, pp.1-76
28 For example: 1) 'ATPA'; 2) the genitive feminine ending in 'TENA' rather then 'TENA' (T-254); 3) the dative singular occurs in the words 'FEBR', 'EGR' and 'KOMBE'; 4) The root 'PRK' appears three times in the prayer, with one exception 'PRK'.
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'ж' common to East Slavonic sources, and 'ж',\(^29\) reflects residual eleventh-century forms or derives from the Second South Slavonic influence. For example, in the prayer during the intercessions the people intercede for those who thirst, described in the Synodal manuscript as 'сили... ел...и' and in T-224 as 'жж'.

Reduced vowels which occur in a strong position are generally written as full vowels, a trait which Moldovan observes in the Slovo. In the prayer there are also instances when the reduced vowels are preserved, for example, in the words 'весть', 'дал го' and 'пода жи'. One example of an early liquid 'ř' survives - 'тряпить', which reads in T-224 as 'тряпить'. Other traits which Moldovan discovers in the Slovo, such a fairly correct use of 'ě' and 'ě', and the predominantly unpalatalized velars, also apply to the prayer. Near the end of the prayer the early Russian form 'памятнě' is unique to the Synodal manuscript. All these features point to an earlier date for the prototype of the manuscript.

Declensions also generally reflect early patterns. The prayer in the Synodal manuscript preserves the dative singular form as 'гвачом' while all the variants of the short prayer, bar one, read 'гвачу'.\(^30\) Nominative and accusative plural endings of ia-stem nouns end in the more archaic 'и' in the prayer, for example 'заидим' and 'пожимл', with the nominative/accusative plural of 'объяс' appearing twice as 'объяс'.\(^31\) An older form glimpsed in the Slovo but more visible in the prayer, is the generally correct use of the dative form 'ток'.

The sheer number of short-form adjectives in the Slovo and the prayer is striking. Two short adjectives 'воздр' and 'слабеть' are unique to

\(^{29}\) Moldovan comments that 'ж' is often, though not invariably, written as a titlo. If 'ж' is written on the line, however, it would suggest more strongly an earlier dating.

\(^{30}\) In the genitive plural all the variants of the short prayer employ 'гвач', whereas the Synodal manuscript reads 'гвач', an old o-stem ending.

\(^{31}\) While the Synodal manuscript refers to 'душша нас', T-224 and its variants read 'душша нас', which is closer to the Old Church Slavonic form.
the prayer in the Synodal manuscript. Evidence of the prayer’s antiquity and linguistic kinship with the *Pokhvala* and the *Slovo* is also seen by the use of the adjective ‘false’, used in the dative singular as ‘αληθινή’. Only the prayer of the Synodal manuscript has the uncontracted form of the adjective ‘αληθινή’, while other manuscripts of the prayer read ‘αλήθεια’ or ‘αλή’ prefixed to ‘προφητεία’.

The same early and uncontracted form is found in the *Slovo* to describe the infallible word of Christ - ‘ιναληθινή’. Another adjective which marks the *Slovo* and the prayer in the Synodal manuscript is ‘carnal’ in the form of ‘παράνοητα’. Instead of ‘παράνοητα’ the other fifteen manuscripts of the short and long prayer use either ‘τριάθρια’, or more commonly ‘παράγωνα’. In the *Slovo* the adjective occurs as ‘παράγωνα’ and ‘παράγωνον’, and in the latter instance Moldovan notes that the more likely variant is ‘παράγων’.

Verb conjugations also reflect earlier forms. In the *Slovo* Moldovan notes the ending ‘το’ for the third person singular and plural in the present and future tenses. In the prayer verbs of the present tense third person plural also generally end with a soft jer in the Synodal manuscript, for example ‘νιώθει’ and ‘νιώθει’. In addition, earlier aorist forms indicate an archaic level of language. Simple aorist forms ending in ‘τα’ were relatively rare by the fifteenth century and evidently are a source of confusion for the scribes of the prayer. It is therefore striking that in the Synodal manuscript the two aorist forms are used correctly, ‘με... σταδά εξέ ηνέον ηνάστα τοντι, ἀκτοτρῇ ἐπὶ ηδυδῆ ηναλακαλλῆν’. By contrast, manuscript T-224 transposes the second verb into a pronominal past participle, ‘σταδά εξέ ηνάστα ηνέον’.
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32 The first reading is found in T-224, variants A, B, C, & D of the long prayer, the second in variants E & F of the long prayer.
33 Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.94, 188v
34 Variant B reads ‘μιαδονοι παρανοι’.
35 See Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.80, fol.171 and p.84, fol.175v respectively.
36 Moldovan admits that this could be a dialectical feature (*Slovo*, p.58).
37 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.195v
and variant B changes the verb forms, significantly altering the meaning, ‘стадо иже ново начат пастыти, истергни...’ In manuscript T-254 the early aorists have disappeared, ‘стадо иже ново начато пастыти, истергни...’

Present active participles are also influenced by earlier forms. Possibly a trace of the Common Slavonic combination d+j lingers in the nominal plural ‘втогадаци’, a reading found in the Synodal manuscript and in T-224. This participle contrasts with other alternative readings - ‘втождаци’ (A, B) ‘втождаци’ (C) and ‘втождаци’ (recorded in the short prayer and its variants). Texts of the prayer also vacillate between the older accusative or the newer genitive plurals of animate objects reflected in the active participles. The Synodal manuscript, T-224 and T-254, manuscripts from the late fourteenth to fifteenth century, more commonly use the accusative rather than the genitive plural. For example, referring to God’s promise to accept those who repent, they read ‘каричат’, ‘каричает’ and ‘каричает’ respectively, contrasting with the majority of the variants which employ the genitive ‘каричишься’.

Although the evidence is not conclusive at every point, a brief linguistic survey of the Slovo, the Pokhvala and the prayer suggests first, that the scribe of the Synodal manuscript used a manuscript which reflected an early copy of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati, and second, that the prayer was joined to the Slovo at an early date. The language of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript reveals traces of earlier forms not found in the other known manuscripts of the prayer, neither in T-254 nor in T-224. This comparison is further evidence of the antiquity of the prayer recorded in the Synodal manuscript.

---

38 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia, p.128
39 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia, p.137
40 See N.A. Meshcherskii, 'K izucheniiu iayka “Slova o zakoni i blagodati”', TODL, 30, 1976, pp.231-7 & Moldovan, 'K voprosu', passim. Both list a number of these archaic features of the prayer. In addition Moldovan notes that in the Synodal manuscript ‘r’, ‘k’ and ‘x’ are unpalatalized and are followed by ‘u’. 

---
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Stylistically, the prayer of the Synodal manuscript is patterned more consistently by triads than other manuscripts which include the prayer. For example, when the people repent the writer lists three verbs, and then expands the petition by elaborating on each verb in turn, 'καλείνα, προσίμα, μολίμβ. Καλείνα λαλήσεις σώματα; προσίμα, ἀδεινά τοῦ πολέος εἰς σάρκα ἡσαβα; μολιμβ, δα ἀναστήσεις σώματε πομπούς νύν'. By contrast, Rozov's principal manuscript of the long prayer, T-224, spoils this symmetry, 'καλείνα, καλείνα λαλήσεις σώματα, καὶ προσίμα ἀδεινά τοῦ πολέος εἰς σάρκα ἡσαβα; μολιμβ, δα ἀναστήσεις σώματε πομπούς νύν'. Among the variants of the prayer, two follow T-224, another retains the ordering of the Synodal manuscript, a fourth omits the initial listing of the verbs, while two later manuscripts begin with the verb 'παλαμένα'. Rozov's principal manuscript of the short prayer also shows a break in the triad discussed above, 'καλείνα, προσίμα, καὶ μολίμβα ὑπατής σώματα, καὶ προσίμα ἀδεινά τοῦ πολέος εἰς σάρκα ἡσαβα. Μολίμβα δα ἀναστήσεις σώματε πομπούς νύν'. The variant readings of the short prayer, bar one, omit the repetition of 'προσίμα', which also deviates from the triadic arrangement of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript. Having expressed repentance, the writer indicates the sincerity of their petition by a double triad of imperatives, 'σώζε, θυσίες, προσέρχετε, πολέμισε, σώματας, πομπούς νύν'. These imperatives are crowned with a threefold affirmation that they belong to God, 'τοῦ ἐσμ' τοῦ σώζε, τοῦ σώζε, τοῦ σώζε'. The short prayer instead employs a pair, omitting the second element, 'τοῦ ἐσμ' τοῦ τρέψα, τοῦ τρέψα'. The triadic pattern preserved in the Synodal manuscript in cries of repentance, supplication and
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41 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.171, fol.196v
42 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo nasledia', p.131
43 These concern variants A & D; C; B; E, and F respectively.
44 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo nasledia', p.139
45 Only variant E retains 'προσίμα'.
46 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.171, fol.196v
47 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.171, fol.196v-7
48 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo nasledia', p.139
finally belonging, is stylistically consistent and suggests that it is earlier than other variants, particularly compared with the text of the short prayer.

Paired expressions are also more meticulously used in the Synodal manuscript. For example, the writer compares human inability to withstand God's anger to dust before a storm, 'не поститься во прахъ противъ бури, и мы противъ гнезду тьмы'. A later variant of the long prayer, 'аки прах пред лицемъ ветру, не уже малы ставящемся милости', loses the sharpness of the repeated 'against' and introduces an alternative and related image of transience, the wind. Rozov's principal manuscript of the short prayer T-254 also lacks precision and replaces dust with a second reference to the storm, 'не поститься во прахъ противъ бури, тако противъ бури тьмы'. The stylistic precision in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript mirrors that of the Slovo and the Pokhvala, providing further evidence that this text more closely reflects its prototype.

While the Pokhvala naturally seeks to glorify the princes and the achievements of Rus' as an emerging Christian nation, the prayer by its nature confesses the shortcomings of the people of Rus'. The speaker admits that they are still a new and little flock:

Не встай нась, лице и еще бдальнымь, не утреся нась, аще и еще
сгоршаешь ти, ачис новокупленнія раби, въ всемь не сподоби Господа своего.

---

49 Rozov, 'Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.197
50 Variant E. Two other variants of the long prayer D and F also replace the image of the storm with the wind. These images echo psalm 82 where human transience is described as chaff in the face of the wind 'аки стекамъ предъ лицемъ ветру' (v.14), and God's anger is seen as a storm 'тако противъ гнезду тьмы, ставящихся ли' (v.16, Psalterium Sinaicum, col.112a).
51 Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.139. Other variants record 'anger' in place of a repeated reference to 'storm'. An additional pointer to the earlier origin of the Synodal manuscript is also its punctuation. Apart from the lack of marking between the prayer and the confessions of faith, Rozov observes that the works attributed to Ilarion in the Synodal manuscript show consistent and careful punctuation. He notes that the prayer is distinguished by longer sections without punctuation. One reason he suggests for this difference, is that the prayer may have been chanted without expression (Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.150).
Compared with the traditional bastions of Christian faith, such as Rome and Constantinople, Rus’ could be regarded as a new flock for a couple of centuries. Rus’ could not, however, reasonably be described as a little flock for the same duration of time. The writer refers to their recent conversion as a fact mitigating their continued wandering and sin, and in depicting the people as a little flock, he recalls Jesus’ words spoken to the ‘little flock’ as though they were intended for Rus’. Various stylistic and syntactic devices mark the internal coherence of this reading. The triad of negative imperatives ‘не встаньте’, ‘не втерите’ and ‘не вьлись’, shows the increasing seriousness of God’s response; he could abandon, reject and finally become angry with them. This triad is matched by three clauses, ‘и вы еще вавилон’, ‘и вы еще строили ти’ and ‘и вы мало стадо’, in which the first clause echoes the phrase which precedes it (reference to their straying follows the invocation of the good shepherd ‘пастырь добрый, положивши душу за ве́щь’). The third time when they admit their frailty and acknowledge that they are a little flock, their confession is met with the reassuring words of Jesus. By contrast, in T-224 (Rozov’s principal manuscript of the long prayer), the suppliants do not describe themselves as a little flock, though Jesus’ words are still addressed to them as a little flock:

"Не встаньте нас, аще и еще строили ти, како невежданий раби вь вься не огодаще Господу своему, не вьлись нас, аще и еще вавилон, не боися малое мое стадо."

53 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.195v
54 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.129. Likewise, T-254, Rozov’s principal manuscript of the short prayer, does not depict the people as a little flock but retains the expressions ‘и втерли нас’ and ‘и дари к нам’ in the people’s cry, ‘не встаньте нас, аще и еще строили ти, ако невежданий раби вь вься не огодаще Господу своему. Не гвьлись нас, аще и еще вавилон, не втерли нас, не дари к намь. Не боися малое мое стадо’ (Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, pp.137-8).
The triadic pattern, together with the increasing seriousness of both the people’s sin and God’s response, is obscured, further reinforcing the suggestion that T-224 is of later provenance than the Synodal manuscript.

The *Pokhvala* also paints a picture of Rus’ as a country which has recently come to know God, whose bishops are described as new fathers. Müller’s observation that the prayer projects a depleted Christianity compared to the picture of a burgeoning faith in the *Pokhvala* is, I would suggest, in keeping with the different intent of both works. In the light of the *Slovo*, new also symbolizes the distinction between the old and new covenants, between law and grace. When Christ’s grace embraces the earth, Ilarion explains the change in terms of old and new, citing ‘new’ three times in a medley of Biblical quotations, ‘вечна мимолетна, и ненасть быстротечен’. Later in his sermon he again connects what is new with the work of grace, likening the new teaching of grace to new wine, contained in new skins, given to new nations: ‘Не нов новы мечы, новые языки’. Thus in the context of the *Slovo*, the identity of Rus’ as a newly pastured flock and new-bought servants may also refer to a nation who enjoys the new teaching of grace.

As well as new, the people’s relationship with God is shown to be dynamic. Within the confines of dogma, the prayer conducts something of a dialogue between the people and God. This is often reflected in the positioning of pronouns. Expressing their whole-hearted devotion to God,

56 Comparing the prayer’s depiction of the recent conversion of Rus’ with the *Pokhvala*’s picture of an established and flourishing Christianity, Müller wonders whether the two works were written at different times. See Müller, ‘Ilarion Werke’, pp12-16. Another commentator cites Christ’s address to the ‘little flock’ as proof that Christianity was ineffective in changing the pagan culture. This appears to the commentator to contradict the depiction of Jaroslav in the *Pokhvala* as the ruler who consolidates Christianity. The admission of faltering faith is interpreted as evidence of general fragility. See the commentary by T.A. Sumnikova, V.V. Mil’kov and A.I. Makarov in Bazhenova, *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie*, 1, p.92-3. However, a confession of weakness marks most prayers and cannot be cited as a proof that the *Pokhvala* and the prayer were originally two unconnected works.
57 Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.83, fol.174-4v
58 Moldovan, *Slovo*, p.88, fol.180
the writer begins each clause with the pronoun ‘to you’: ‘τε μισοῦμ, τοιῇ προπαλαμῖ, τοιῇ κα μιλή δέβεμ.’ The writer’s use of pronouns in the parallel phrases ‘ὡς τε ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῖχ’ heightens the contrast between God’s blessing and the people’s unrighteousness, ‘εἰς εἰς θαλαμὸν ὡς τε ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῖχ’. Another striking example of the interplay between personal pronouns is the juxtaposition of ‘ναμὰ τεκ’ in the confession, ‘να ἡμῖν οὐκελλαιμὴ ι προμαῖου ἡμᾶς, να ἡμῖν τεκ κε δίκαιαμ’. Two dative absolutes are juxtaposed in such a way as to reveal the depth of God’s faithfulness compared with the ignominy of the people’s indifference. The adversative conjunction ‘καὶ’ also intensifies the contrast. In general conjunctions such as ‘but’, ‘for’ and ‘if’ often redirect or sharpen a request, contributing to the overall sense of rhythm and dynamic in the people’s relationship with God.

Confession is made with the awareness that the people are a new, little flock that has been brought into relationship with God. They appeal to their frailty and the recentness of their commitment as reasons which should call forth God’s patient and merciful response to them. The tone of a prayer is generally judged on the extent to which the themes of confession and repentance are thought to predominate. A number of scholars, including Moldovan and Rozov, argue that the penitent tone of the prayer clashes with the joyful tone of the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and must therefore have been written at another point. This argument, however, must be viewed with caution since by no means all scholars are agreed about the tone of the prayer. Mil’kov, for example, is struck by the prayer’s joyful

59 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196
60 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.197
61 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.197v
62 If the Slovo is imbued with the atmosphere of the Easter liturgy, then Rozov feels the prayer expresses a Lenten and penitent mood. See Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, pp.146-78. Moldovan echoes Rozov’s opinion that the content, tone, genre and addressee distinguish the prayer from the Slovo and the Pokhvala. He too posits that the works of the Synodal manuscript were stitched together subsequently by Ilarion. See Moldovan, ‘K voprosu’, p.156.
ring and the way it harmonizes with the *Slovo*. He is surprised by the writer’s sure confidence in God’s providence and the lack of emphasis on humility, tears and suffering as the path to salvation. Likewise he notes that judgement is hardly mentioned, suggesting that on the contrary, God is somehow blamed for man’s frailty and sinfulness. He interprets the remark, ‘не тяготит наши естества долго носить гнёздо тело’, as a veiled threat to God.

Bazhenova also explains the depiction of man’s infirmity as a sign that man has no free will, and ultimately God is responsible for sin, since he has power to give life and death. While agreeing that the prayer shows a buoyant confidence in God’s mercy and a profound awareness of people’s frailty, I would argue that God is not held responsible for sin in view of the writer’s admission that their wrong deeds deserve God’s anger, ‘наложи гнёздо, мнестике, его же достины есмь по делам нашим’.

Scholars argue that the prayer was originally written at a time of specific need which called for confession, being joined at a later point to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. Müller suggests that the prayer was written ten to fifteen years earlier than the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* at a time of danger. Rozov presumes that the prayer was occasioned by any one of the disasters listed in the title, ‘Молитва предстоящего отца нашего Иларiona митрополита Российского к наществи инымненных и за вёздажан и в смртное и за всяко присяние’, or indeed any other calamity which demanded repentance for sins. He rightly doubts, however, that Ilarion would have written the title himself. Besides which, in the prayer when they ask God not to
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64 Bazhenova, *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie*, 1, p.91
65 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196
66 Müller suggests that the people’s plea ‘наложи гнёздо, мнестике, его же достины есмь по делам нашим’, was spoken at a time of particular danger. He acknowledges, however, that the prayer continues in a more general vein (‘Ilarion Werke’, p.16).
67 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, pp.146-78. Rozov lists two other titles of the prayer which name Ilarion as the author. The title of the manuscript Rozov designates A reads: ‘Молитва предстоящего отца нашего Иларiona митрополита Российского к наществи имплеменных и за вёздажан и в смртнее и за всяко присяние’. The title of C reads: ‘Молитва предстоящего отца нашего Иларiona митрополита Российского к наществи имплеменных и за вёздажан и в смртнее и за всяко присяние’.

128
unleash hardships, famines, death, fire and flood, these requests appear to be more general in character and no one disaster is singled out. In three variant manuscripts more specific petitions are added so that the people intercede for the sick,\textsuperscript{68} and in manuscript T-224 intercession is made for the land to be fruitful and for the welfare of young and old.\textsuperscript{69} In prayer books, prayers written for times of drought or famine regularly interpret disaster more markedly as a result of God's anger over sin. A characteristic plea in time of drought, found in an eighteenth-century manuscript, is, \textsuperscript{70} The writers of the \textit{Povest' vremennykh let} also interpret disasters as divine punishment. Punishment in this life is seen as the people's due, a call to repentance so that they might be refined like gold and not be punished in the next life. The chronicler reasons that Rus' is a favoured nation and therefore the punishment for sin is now more severe.\textsuperscript{71} In the prayer there is no hint that Rus' should receive harsher treatment from God because of its favoured status. God's anger in the prayer is depicted in relation to the present and the people do not dwell on the Day of Judgement. Whereas repentance is a key theme of the prayer, it is not linked to a concrete event.

The writer of the prayer is particularly conscious of the feebleness of the people's faith and the frailty of their nature. In the Synodal manuscript the people petition God, 'малы показы, а много помиши; малы язви, а милостиво исцели; емалевъ исцели, а еякоре щелкъ'.\textsuperscript{72} They ask God to remove temptation because of their weakness, 'имоведи исцели, яко пер' сть есмы и нрахъ'.\textsuperscript{73} Literally the people ask God to 'take past' temptation, showing an

\textsuperscript{68} 'Господи, греши наша, и гнезд втрети, иже нане, спасе, наведуй по правде, и подаждь съ ннеге дожди водныя земли.'
\textsuperscript{69} 'Mало похв, а много помилуи; малы язви, а милостиво исцел; емалевъ исцел, а еякоре щелъ.'
\textsuperscript{70} 'Писа́десъ нины́е, младенца клюпи́ть, стары́сть пода́рши' (Rozov, 'Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia', p.135). Variant D also contains this reading.
\textsuperscript{71} Trebnik, M 1732, School of Slavonic and East European Studies (London), p.239v.
\textsuperscript{72} Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.173, fol.198v
\textsuperscript{73} Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.171, fol.196
even greater awareness of human frailty than the request from the Lord’s prayer used in the short prayer, ‘не веря въ искищенъ’. In a further plea in the Synodal manuscript, the speaker beseeches God not to bring disaster so that those of faltering faith should not fall away, ‘да не впали въ веру нестерпимъ верою’.\(^\text{74}\) In manuscript T-224 the meaning is reversed and the assertion is made that those of faltering faith will not fall away, ‘не впали въ верою верою’.\(^\text{75}\) Although later variants include ‘для’, they attach it to a milder version of the sentiment, so that it is not a question of people falling away from faith but of the faint-hearted losing confidence in God’s mercy, ‘для отчаяния малышины милости твоей’.\(^\text{76}\) Later scribes may have found the idea of loss of faith too extreme for a country where Christianity was established, or perhaps they regarded it as something of a threat to God, opting instead for the gentler version of growing faint-hearted. Overall, the writer of the prayer of the Synodal manuscript expresses an exuberant confidence in God’s mercy which overshadows the weakness of human nature.

Confession is less Lenten in tone than Rozov suggests. Cries of faith and penitence intersperse the people’s confession. For example, before a long list of verbs of confession, the writer emphasizes how eagerly they seek God: ‘тебе низемь, тебе припадаемь, тебе са мил вамь’.\(^\text{77}\) After confessing their sins, the people repent using the words: ‘къ жити, просимъ, молимъ’.\(^\text{78}\) By inserting a determined response of penitence immediately before and after, confession is punctuated with hope. One of the sins listed is that of attachment to earthly things ‘земний сбъ земныхъ преклонихомъ’. This confession indicates man’s earthbound nature rather than his wilful disobedience. After a second and longer confession, the

\(^{74}\) Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.198v
\(^{75}\) Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.134
\(^{76}\) Variants D, E and F.
\(^{77}\) Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196
\(^{78}\) Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.171, fol.196v
people are quick to affirm their belonging and faithfulness to God. They point to the fervour of their present response alongside past sin. This creates an arena for change and balance rather than a sculptured relief of man ever sinner and God ever judge.

The petitions in the prayer naturally reflect the society in which they were composed. In several manuscripts the writer prays that they will not experience internecine conflicts. Significantly, this plea occurs neither in the Synodal manuscript nor in the later variants of the long prayer, since at the time of Iaroslav I (as later under Muscovite hegemony) such a plea was unnecessary. Later readings also tend to embellish the names of intercessors, adding to their number and using additional epithets. For example, the prayer in the Synodal manuscript describes John the Baptist as 'предтеча твоего крестителя Іван' [IVAN'] 82 while T-224 reads 'честного и славного пророка и предтеча твоего Іван' [IVAN']. Two variants of the long prayer expand on the list of fathers to include Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, John Chrysostom, St Nicholas and the Princes Vladimir, Boris and Gleb, as well as the founders of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Antonii and Feodosii. The intercessions in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript are the least adorned and reflect the society of the eleventh century, both factors which indicate its early provenance.

Intercessions can also be indicative of a people’s perception of nationhood. It is a mark of the Emperor’s authority as God’s regent that throughout the Byzantine Empire he was to be mentioned in the prayers of all the countries which had converted to Orthodoxy. Even if he had no real

---

79 The people declare that they do not lift their hands to a foreign god, nor follow a false prophet, nor hold to heretical teaching, but rather they call on the true God, raise their eyes to heaven and lift their hands to God (Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.172, fol.198).
80 T-224 and variants A, B and C.
81 Variants D, E and F.
82 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.199
83 Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.136
84 Variants A and C
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power in a country, this intercession at least would concede his formal authority. Likewise, in the *Zhitie Feodosiia* Feodosii orders Iziaslav to be mentioned before Sviatoslav in the litany, even after the latter is ruling as prince of Kiev and Iziaslav is living in exile. By this act Feodosii recognizes Iziaslav as the rightful prince of Kiev. In the prayer of the Synodal manuscript the people intercede for the rulers (*vladykie*), whereas in some other manuscripts of the long prayer people pray for the prince or their princes in the plural. Significantly, 'vladykie' is not a personal title but denotes more generally the function of ruling, which would not apply so specifically to the rulers of Rus', as the terms prince or kagan do. Given that intercession has already been made in the *Pokhvala* for kagan Iaroslav, the prayer's more general intercession for rulers (*vladykie*) seems particularly appropriate here.

If Moldovan's interpretation of the opening words of the prayer is accepted, and 'cмьрь же гдь' is translated 'to these', Vladimir and Iaroslav would be seen to receive glory and honour for their labours.

---

85 John A. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism*, North Carolina, 1982, pp.146-50, points out that even during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries when the Church of Rus' endorsed obedience to the Mongol rulers, it still reserved the supreme place in the liturgy for the Byzantine emperor.

86 The long prayer: S-591 'ладанка'; T-224 'кнажа'; A, B, C 'ладанка'; D 'кнажд'; E, F 'ладанка'.

87 Müller objects that the petition in the *Pokhvala* and the prayer is too repetitive to have been originally part of a single work. The prayer, however, unlike the *Pokhvala* does not intercede specifically for the kagan (Ilarion Werke, p.12). Paszkiewicz argues that the petition 'ладанка наши намед крагди' is earlier and more authentic than the one found in the Synodal manuscript, 'ладанка наши огради стряпна'. The first reading appears to support his theory that the word 'иацик' in early texts can refer to an eparchy. He argues that the people of Rus' were less belligerent than their later Muscovite counterparts and therefore they petitioned God to protect the prince by the eparchy (H. Paszkiewicz, *The Making of the Russian Nation*, London, 1963, pp.41-8). Seven manuscripts, however, retain the verb 'строим', omitting the phrase 'ладанка', which in any case points to a later date. Paszkiewicz overlooks the fact that 'ладанка' indicates an earlier reading and that only the later manuscripts, in this study the seventeenth-century variants D and E, prefer 'строим' to 'строим'. Lastly, there are precedents in the Old Testament for such prayers.

88 Only the prayer in the Synodal manuscript begins with the phrase 'смьрь же гдь'. Traditionally this has been translated as 'therefore', 'moreover', a suitable word to link the prayer to the *Pokhvala*. Moldovan argues, however, it be could be translated 'to these', since the Synodal manuscript contains a number of examples where the dative plural ends with a soft jer. He also doubts that a fifteenth-century editor would make such an amendment. If he did, then surely he argues, the editor would have added a hard jer (смьрь) and positioned the pronoun near the verb. See Moldovan, 'K вопросу', pp.151-6. By the end of the *Pokhvala* Iaroslav is seen to join the
opening of the prayer Vladimir, and potentially Jaroslav too, are seen as powerful intercessors on behalf of the people. In other manuscripts of the prayer, space is left for the prince to be named, so that in manuscript T-224 the editor includes the phrase ‘тимохь милю твою на престоле, князь нашим имет речь’. Similarly in T-254, Rozov’s principal manuscript for the short prayer, a space is left for the individual names of the prince and the archbishop. In later manuscripts, room is left for the names of the tsar, the grand prince, the tsaritsa, the princess and their children and the Patriarch of Moscow. Alterations made to the titles of secular and ecclesiastical authorities reflect the changing political climate and reveal a society which increasingly recognized different strata.

While manuscripts of the short prayer include intercession for the tsar and his family, or for the prince and the archbishop, none of the manuscripts of the long prayer, even those from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, record intercession for the tsar and the archbishop. In this respect, it is worth noting that only the short prayer occurs in the New Year’s service, in which intercession plays an important part, in particular intercession made on behalf of the tsar and the ecclesiastical heavenly company through the efficacy of Vladimir’s prayers and his own labours. This corresponds with the opening of the prayer, which pictures God as exalted and glorious, rewarding the princes for their labour in heaven.

If ‘имь же егда’ is not seen to refer to the princes, the beginning of the prayer can be easily adapted. For example, the writer of T-224 employs the pronominal present participle ‘the one who gives’ and re-positions the pronoun ‘us’, so that the prayer obviously addresses the suppliants rather than the princes, ‘падаем путешествам олень и честь, причастники ны се вверя святаго царства’ (Rozov, ‘Iz tvorcheskogo naslediia’, p.128).

Rozov suggests that the reference to the prince and archbishop in the earlier manuscripts of the short prayer, combined with the Novgorodian origin of three of the six manuscripts he uses, indicates the Novgorodian provenance of the short prayer. By contrast manuscripts of the long prayer are of Muscovite origin, and, significantly, even in the later manuscripts intercessions do not include the tsar or tsaritsa. He cites this as evidence for the earlier origin of the long prayer (N.N. Rozov, ‘Rukopisnaia traditsiia “Slova o zakone i blagodati”’, TODL, 17, 1961, p.50).
hierarchy. With a shorter penitential section than the long prayer and an increased number of intercessions, the short prayer is better suited for the New Year’s office. In addition, one of its petitions ‘Лево мирное мирное дары’, make it directly relevant to the New Year’s service.\(^93\)

The fact that the long prayer was similar to one used at New Year did not miss the eye of the fifteenth-century scribe of the Synodal manuscript, who scribbled a note in the margin, ‘и на автопрозвании да молитва тоже, и подобна’. Gorskii also comments on the coincidence of a prayer which is read at New Year entitled ‘молитва ко Господу нашему Иисусу Христу за Царя и за все Христяны’, identifying it with the prayer that Archbishop Gurii said in 1555 in the newly conquered area of Kazan’. The prayer is described as ‘господин Митрополита Илария Русского за Царя и за все Православие’. He assumes that it must be the same prayer as found in the Synodal manuscript, and cites this reference to Ilarion’s prayer as evidence for his authorship of both the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer.\(^94\)

Zhdanov, refuting Ilarion’s authorship of the prayer in the Synodal manuscript and the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, suggests that the editor found the closing petition to Vladimir inadequate, and added a prayer possibly known to him from the New Year’s service. Here, he conjectures, the similarity of the opening words with those at the end of the *Pokhvala* and the nature of a prayer entitled ‘за Царя и за все Христяны’ made it fitting.

Reversing Zhdanov’s assumption that the long prayer was taken from the New Year’s service, I suggest on the contrary, that Ilarion’s prayer may have been adapted for the service at a later point. This remains only a suggestion, as the link between the short prayer and the New Year’s service must first be investigated more thoroughly.

---

\(^93\) In one seventeenth-century New Year’s office the short prayer is prefaced by the note, ‘Алея в мирное мирное дары’ (Nikol’skii, ‘Chin letoprovodstva’, p.155).

\(^94\) Partly on this basis he assumes that Ilarion is author of the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*. He also points to similar expressions common to the confession of faith and the *Slovo*, as well as the artistic skill which characterizes both the *Slovo* and the prayer (Gorskii, ‘Pamiatniki’, pp.213-4).
The editor’s note in the Synodal manuscript correctly observes that the long prayer resembles the short one but is not identical to it. The mention of intercession for the tsar in the title ‘за Царя и за все християны’ naturally points to a period after the eleventh century. It is also important not to miss the connection between the title of the prayer and the occasion on which Archbishop Gurii was instructed to say it. The title tsar was one adopted by Ivan IV a few years earlier, and the occasion was the conquest of Kazan’. Intercessions made for the tsar in this newly conquered territory would help to reinforce his authority. While one cannot be certain that Gurii recited the words of Ilarion’s prayer, its title contrasts with the prayer of the Synodal manuscript which simply reads ‘всю землю накликай’. Thus the title of the prayer which Archbishop Gurii was given to pronounce focusses more on one person who exercises authority over his kingdom (tsarstvo), while the title of the long prayer emphasizes its role as a united response from the whole land.

A unifying theme of the Slovo, the Pokhvala and the prayer is the idea that the new relationship with God is for the whole land and for all people, regardless of age and status. The Slovo illustrates how God pours out his grace on the whole earth, and concludes with a number of prophecies exhorting all people to praise God, ‘и Царем всемилостивым, рабам и свободным, женам и старым, бедным и богатым, единонародным и многонациональным’.95 Vladimir too emphasizes that his command to be baptized is for all the people, ‘младым и великимъ, рабам и свободнымъ, женам и старымъ, беднымъ и богатымъ’.96 Intercession in the prayer is made firstly for the people in general (предложи милость твою на людей этихъ) and then for peace, for the rulers, the boiars, the towns, the Church and once again for the people (мужи и жены и молодцѣ спаси).97 This order is in

---

95 Moldovan, Slovo, p.91, fol.184
96 Moldovan, Slovo, p.93, fol.186v. The Synodal manuscript alone mentions the boiars and the simple folk. All other redactions omit these categories.
97 Rozov, ‘Sinodal’nyi spisok’, p.173, fol.198v-9
keeping with Chrysostom's recommendation that prayer be made first for
the people and then for rulers. By contrast, the scribe of manuscript T-224
specifies the prince and the boiars before a general prayer for the people,
'нымохі патят твое кнаже нашым, нпет рк, и на боааа і вонх кр, і на всх лада твоїх'.
Since a second petition for the prince and boiars is repeated shortly afterwards, it suggests that the earlier intercession was
inserted deliberately so that the prince and boiars would take precedence. A
prayer taken from the seventeenth-century New Year's office presents the
same hierarchical ordering of the intercessions with the tsar taking first
place, then the Church, and lastly the town and all the people, 'свяаа и
сохрани в мире, верхаго цапь, церковь, и град, и всх людъ твоя,
The first place given to the people in the intercession of
the long prayer fits its overall focus on a united people. Likewise in the
Pokhvala, Vladimir is asked to intercede first for land and people, and then
for the kagan laroalav: 'помолиа в земли своя и в люди... паче же помолиа в
свя твоим, благословим кагане нашеа. Гемпі'.
In the long prayer intercession is made for the Church which is
perceived as a single inheritance, a corporate body of men, women and
children: 'церковь твою възрасти, достойнъ своя свяаа, мужи, жены и маладенець
спаи'. Intercession for 'your Church' in the singular, rather than for

98 P. Schaff (ed.), Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians,
Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, XIII, Michigan, 1956, p.426. This excerpt is drawn
from one of his homilies on the First Letter to Timothy based on the text, 'I exhort therefore, that
first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men: for
kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness
and honesty'.
99 Rozov, 'Из творческого наследия', p.135
100 Nikol'skii, 'Чин летопроводства', p.148. Taken from the 1646 prayerbook of metropolitan
Peter Mogila. In other examples, the order of intercessions depends on the position of the writer.
For example, in a prayer for Saturday Matins Kirill of Turov intercedes first for himself and the
community, second for people of ecclesiastical rank, third for Orthodox tsars and princes,
fourthly for those who support their monastery and last for all Christians. See Kirill von Turov.
101 Moldovan, Sлово, fol.194v-5
102 Rozov, 'Синодальни списк', p.173, fol.199
churches in the plural 'церкви еднасты' (manuscript T-224), conveys better the idea of the Church and the people as a united identity rather than a stratified one. Likewise by praying for the Church as a whole, the long prayer does not name ecclesiastical offices which would later obscure the vision of the Church foremost as a united people.

After petitions for those in difficult circumstances, the speaker intercedes for everyone: 'єка помилуй, єка спаси, єка утвердуй, радуйся твора ім'я і т'єлицю і душению'.

Mercy, comfort and joy are the keynotes. The heavenly hosts, the Virgin, John the Baptist, the apostles, prophets, martyrs, and saints, are seen to intercede for those on earth. The people pray that they may be pastured in oneness of faith, 'пасоми в едненії ведь', an image which recalls the beginning of the prayer. Here Jesus is invoked as the good shepherd who has laid down his life for the sheep, sheep who may stray, but nevertheless comprise the small flock to whom Jesus promises the heavenly kingdom. The image of a flock of sheep possesses both Biblical resonance and strengthens the sense of common identity and oneness. Unity and joy are also expressed in the people's praise of God, 'єжешь, весело і радостно славимъ та'. This final note of celebration echoes the concluding scene of the Slovo, which pictures God enthroned over the whole earth and its people caught up in praise of him, 'да възвеселится и възрадуются на землѣ, и вси на землѣ въплящше рабами и възглавитсѧ Божь пасомы радасты'.

Ultimate unity is glimpsed in the nature of the Trinity, indivisibly one, ruling over and uniting the heavens and the earth, angels and mankind, the visible and invisible creation, 'троицѧ нераздельнаѧ, единосвѧтвrenaѧ, царствующаѧ на небесахъ и на землѣ, агеломъ и человекомъ, видимыѧ и невидимыѧ тѣми'. The Trinity is also the theme of Ilarion's next work, his confession of faith - 'всѧ въ едного Бова'. Thus unity is seen to lie at the heart of the Slovo o

---

103 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.173, fol.199
104 Moldovan, Slovo, pp.90-1, fol.183v
105 Rozov, 'Sinodal'nyi spisok', p.173, fol.199v
zakone i blagodati as grace reaches the whole world, imbuing the prayer with the message of a unified people united in God. In this way the prayer is seen to be integral to the new identity of Rus’.

By contrast, several signs indicate that the short prayer is spoken by a nation no longer on the brink of forming a new Christian identity, but rather by one with some generations of Christian tradition behind it. For example, instead of petitioning God to continue to show mercy on his people, ‘предахи милость Твою на врагов твоих’, the short prayer recalls God’s former mercy, ‘предахи предахи милости Твоей первой’. This suggests an awareness of time passing rather than the cry of a people recently converted. The short prayer also shows less concern for the people as a corporate identity. As has been noted already, more space is devoted to intercessions for the secular and spiritual rulers of Rus’. An additional pointer to the passing of time is evident in the intercession made for those who have died, first for kings and princes and archbishops, second for bishops and those of priestly and monastic rank, and last for all Christians who have pleased God. By the time Ilarion wrote the Slovo o zakone i blagodati, only in Ol’ga’s and Vladimir’s generations had rulers died as Orthodox believers. By contrast, the long prayer concentrates on the living rather than on the departed, ending on a more exuberant tone of joy, unity and praise.

In conclusion, while it cannot be proved that Ilarion wrote the prayer attached to the end of Slovo o zakone i blagodati, it can be shown to fit well into its literary setting. The evidence comes not from the overall shape of the work, or even the occasion for which it was composed, but rather from the thematic and linguistic linking between the prayer and the Slovo o zakone i blagodati. From a linguistic angle, the prayer of the Synodal

---
107 Rozov’s earliest manuscript of the short prayer T-254, makes intercession first for the prince and second for the archbishop, and then for members of the various clerical, priestly or monastic ranks.
manuscript and the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* reflect a similarly archaic level of language. Compared with other manuscripts, the prayer also seems to preserve more faithfully the triadic and paired patterning of sentences, as well as intercessions which fit its earlier dating.

The prayer’s title ‘from our whole land’ is seen to be indicative of Ilarion’s national vision. In the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* and the prayer Ilarion builds an identity on the concept of the ‘ruskaia zemlia’ which is able to bond people into a common identity regardless of tribal or social divisions. The prayer also reflects the idea that God’s blessing is manifest in belonging to a land, and his punishment in exile from their land. Alongside the concept of the ‘ruskaia zemlia’ the prayer develops the *Slovo’s* use of the term people ‘liudie’, signifying those who belong to God. Images which describe the people as a flock or an inheritance also contribute to the projection of a single identity.

The prayer’s emphasis on the whole people is more striking when compared with the short prayer. Here the intercessions are seen indirectly to reinforce positions of authority in society, both secular and sacred. By an expanded number of intercessions as well as other additions, the short prayer is particularly suited to its placing in the New Year’s service. Intercessions for the departed reflect a national awareness of generations of Christian rulers, clerics and people who have died. By contrast the long prayer focusses more on the present in which the people see themselves as a new and little flock under God’s care. They express both their inexperience and frailty as well as their confidence in God’s mercy and forgiveness. Even the language reflects the impression of a young and dynamic relationship rather than a long-established and sculptured pattern of behaviour. The long prayer ends on a note of joy and unity, which underlies the people’s new identity. If the *Slovo* explains how the land of Rus’ is incorporated into the Christian community, and the *Pokhvala* hymns the mortal instrument of
these events, then the prayer is a collective expression which realizes the new relationship with God.
The perception of the Kievan Caves Monastery as a centre of intercession

The writers of Rus’ can be seen to express their identity as a Christian nation not only in the literary portrayals of their rulers, their martyrs, and a grasp of their shared unity as God’s people, but also through the depictions of their leading monasteries. In Egypt, Syria and later in Byzantium, monastic communities and individual monks played an important role in shaping the spiritual life of their country. As well as being places of prayer, monasteries could act as seminaries for future bishops and metropolitans, centres of politics and learning, channels of charity and commerce. Where monasteries flourished they were potentially marks of spiritual greatness and could add prestige to a country which identified itself as Christian. Therefore the bookmen of Kievan Rus’ would have been concerned that its monks and monasteries should be seen to equal, if not to outstrip, the past giants of monastic life, such as St Anthony the Great and St Theodosius. Intercession was a role of national importance which was seen to affect the present condition of a country and also the eternal destiny of individuals.

Although Kievan Rus’ had a number of monasteries, written records focus on the Kievan Caves Monastery.1 Of its two founders, Antonii and Feodosii, more is written about Feodosii. The writings under consideration here include Nestor’s Zhite Feodosiiia, written probably in the 1080s,2 three

---

1 The ‘Caves Monastery’ in this chapter refers to the monastery in Kiev.
2 I will refer to the Uspenskii miscellany since it contains the earliest extant manuscript of the Zhite Feodosiiia. At the end of the Zhite Feodosiiia Nestor discloses his identity: ‘тв же еси, исше але гречаны Нестор, манни еси, в монастырь едженаго и отца властись Феодосии. Приймете же еси в не преподаваемых играхь малыхъ, и ны н же ветъ того естества едия, и меншишь огла ведаеть сцепленые, тако же и на древнихъ соме ветъ неть изведенства сом’ (O.A. Kniazevskaia et al. (eds), Uspenskii
entries in the Povest' vremennykh let (the first s.a.1051, ‘Why the Caves Monastery is so named’, the second s.a.1074, the year of Feodosii’s death, and the third s.a.1091, when his relics were disinterred) and the Kievo-pecherskii paterik, which was compiled in the first half of the thirteenth century by Simon and Polikarp. \(^3\) The focus of this study primarily considers motifs of intercession rather than texts of prayers. \(^4\) The question ‘what

\(^3\) The Kievo-pecherskii paterik contains two letters with Simon and Polikarp’s introductory comments, discourses on the foundation of the Caves Church, an amended version of the Zhitie Feodosiia, material from the chronicle entries, as well as other tales about the Caves Monastery and its monks. I will quote from the edition published by D. Abramovich, Kyievo-Pechers'kii Pateryk, Kiev, 1930; repr. D. Tschizewskij (ed.), Das Paterikon des Kiever Höhlenklosters, (Slavische Propyläen 2), Munich, 1964; hereafter KPP. Simon, editor of the first part of the Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik was probably a monk at the Caves Monastery before the end of the twelfth century. By 1206 he was hegumen of another monastery and subsequently was appointed Bishop of Vladimir (1214-26), compiling his work probably near the end of his life. Polikarp’s discourses are harder to date, but must have been written before the Mongol invasion (see Muriel Heppell (tr. & intro ), The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery, (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations I), Cambridge, Mass., 1989, xxiv-ix; hereafter KPP). Can Nestor the hagiographer be identified with the writer of at least one of the entries about the Caves Monastery in the Povest' vremennykh let? Without reviving well-worn arguments for and against, it is worth noting that all the writers were fostered within the walls of the Caves Monastery and would have had a vested interest in Feodosii as founder and in the monastery itself.

\(^4\) Two prayers in the liturgy have been attributed to Feodosii. Since they occur divorced from a literary setting connected specifically with Feodosii and can only tentatively be attributed to him, I have not included them in my study. A prayer entitled ‘Мольтія країні Печерського чудотворця Феодосія, за країні монастиря’ has been ascribed to Feodosii by several scholars. The reasons for accepting Feodosii’s authorship are not compelling. Moreover, this prayer resembles one included in the thirteenth-century Iaroslav miscellany entitled ‘В борону’ (fol.65-6; also published by I.P. Eremin, ‘Literaturnæ nasledie Feodosiia Pecherskogo’, TODL, 5, 1947, p.184, n.2. He omits the phrase ‘імені імени, імені’ on fol.65v). This last prayer could be an earlier rendering of the prayer’s prototype, and contains no reference to Antonii or Feodosii. See also F. Buslaev, Materialy dla istorii pis'men vostochnykh, grecheskikh, rimskikh i slavianskikh. Izgotovleny k stoletnemu jubileiu imp. Moskovskogo universiteta trudami professorov i prepodavatelei Petrova, Klina, Menshikova i Buslaeva, Moscow, 1855, pp.23-5; K.V. Kharlampovich, ‘O molitvakh prep. Feodosiia pecherskogo’, Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti, 17, 1912, 2, pp.165-74; V.A. Chagovets, ‘Zhizn’ i sochineniia prepodobnago Feodosiia’, Universitetskia Izvestiia, Kiev, 12, 1901, pp.151-222; E.E. Golubinskii, Istoriiia russkoi tserkvi, I, 2nd edn, Moscow, 1901, 1, p.839; Makarii, Istoriiia russkoi tserkvi, II, p.129, n.227. Eremin also draws attention to a prayer in the Iaroslav miscellany entitled ‘Ka zemli y svyatoi vyzv’, which begins ‘Господи! Напомни нам, жите в Иерусалиме’. He argues that it has been mistakenly attributed to John Chrysostom, since the text reads ‘Феодосио, патриархе, молите и нам’. The complex syntax and ornate style of the prayer is uncharacteristic, however, of other prayers and sermons attributed to Feodosii.

---

\(^{142}\) Sbornik XII-XIII vv., Moscow, 1971, (hereafter Usp mise) p.134-5, fol.67b). Most of the evidence favours the 1080’s as the time of composition of the Zhitie Feodosiia. Notably, Nestor does not describe the discovery of Feodosii’s relics which took place in 1091. In addition, although he mentions Feodosii’s successors Stefan and Nikon who died in 1088, he does not refer to Ioann who subsequently took office (see D.I. Abramovich, ‘Issledovanie o “Kievo-Pecherskom Paterike” kak istoriko-literaturnom pamiatnike’, Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti, 6, 1901, 3, pp.207-12).
words did the monks of the Caves Monastery use to pray?' is here eclipsed by a more pertinent line of enquiry, ‘with what effect did they pray?’ There is scope to examine the perception of Feodosii as intercessor, as well as to consider the evolving perception of the Caves Monastery as a place of intercession. First, I will examine how in the Zhittie Feodosiia Nestor depicts Feodosii as an intercessor of international repute, whose prayers are seen to affect not just the day to day running of the monastery, but transform the perception of spiritual reality and sanctify the very ground of the monastery. Second, I will suggest how the stories of the Kievo-pecherskii paterik extend his reputation to include Antonii and later monks, assuring succeeding generations of monks and certain laypeople of continued intercession.

Even though Nestor’s vita is evidently made up of other people’s stories about Feodosii, it nevertheless appears to have the advantage of being fashioned primarily by one hand. There is reason, therefore, to consider whether Nestor’s portrait of Feodosii as intercessor is in some ways distinctive to him. In writing such an account, Nestor can also be seen to pay a literary tribute to his own monastery.

In the exordium to the Zhittie Feodosiia Nestor appears to view Feodosii as something of a spiritual yardstick by which to measure Rus’ and its place within the Christian tradition. Thus Feodosii’s international reputation as intercessor can be seen to have a bearing on the standing of Rus’. Any notion that Rus’ might be inferior because of its late conversion is dispelled by a series of New Testament prophecies Nestor cites, foretelling the conversion of the Gentiles. One prophecy in particular is seen to exonerate the lateness of the conversion of Rus’:

5 For example: ‘... МНОЗИ ЕХАЛЯТБь ОТЪ ВОСТОКА И ЗАПАДА И ЕХАЛЯТБь СЪ АВДАМБМь И СЪ ИОАММь И ИНОКИМЬ ЕСЬ ЦАРСТВИ МОЩНЫМЬ.’ (Usp mise, p.72, fol.26c).
Even though Feodosii’s appearance is also late by comparison with the great monastic fathers such as St Anthony the Great, Nestor reasons that because he belongs to the ‘last and weak generation’, he is all the more remarkable. In this sense, Feodosii surpasses the famous monks to whom other nations could lay claim. Another point helps Nestor put Feodosii in the same league with St Anthony, the earliest and most-acclaimed founder of monasticism. Rather than linking Feodosii first and foremost with his namesake St Theodosius, Nestor likens him to St Anthony. In the Kiev-pecherskii paterik’s version of the Zhitie Feodosiia this apparent omission is picked up. The editor adds a further comparison with St Theodosius, commenting on the devotion with which they both prayed, and their service of the Theotokos.

From the beginning of his vita Nestor portrays Feodosii as a focal point, the morning star to which people of different countries can come to find light.

---


7 ‘Всички прилибът отцък неи са жития, кои подражава целата и началникът църковни съоръжения на Антониос църковния епископ, и о се разказва, как жихнаха и о тяхното кънчак, "следь бъди посветеними рах"’ (Usp misc., p.72, fol.26c).

8 Although St Theodosius was also a pioneer of monasticism in the fifth and sixth centuries, St Anthony lived approximately two centuries earlier (ca 250-356), and hence is a more appropriate model for Feodosii as one of the first founders of monasticism in Rus’.

9 ‘Всичките славянские термини Феодосии, епионимическим архимандриту: славят ес си и е им. Си е били разумно приживи и последователя владарии Епифанис, архи и владалки от тях рацификация експромпции и о нас молятся исправно към Господу о чадях наших’ (KPP, p.21).
This image adds a cosmic dimension to Feodosii’s portrait, establishing him as a figure of international significance, and by proxy Rus’ too. The eastward star is reminiscent of the magi who came from the east guided by a star to the young Christ child. Moreover, the morning star is a precursor of day, symbolically heralding the Second Coming. According to Nestor’s scheme the morning star (read Feodosii) is not solitary for long but is joined by many other stars (read monks), all awaiting the righteous sun of God. Thus the star image portrays Feodosii as both icon and herald of Christ. Feodosii’s individual light is intensified by the stars which cluster around him, so that his individual identity is fused with the corporate identity of the Caves Monastery.

As an intercessor, Feodosii’s prayers were meant to provide for the immediate needs of the monastery as well as to vouchsafe for the monks well-being after they died. Nestor comments that the pasture had been chosen already and was now awaiting the appointed shepherd, thereby introducing a second allegory which he subsequently develops - Feodosii as shepherd. The effectiveness of Feodosii’s intercession is revealed by Nestor’s depiction of the Day of Judgement, as the day when a person’s work is tested. Feodosii is seen to appear before his heavenly judge, not with dread and dismay, but with expectancy and joy. He is portrayed as

10 Usp misc, pp.73-4, fol.27b-c
11 J. Bortnes, ‘Frame technique in Nestor’s Life of St Theodosius’, Scando-Slavica, 13, 1967, pp.5-16, elucidates how Feodosii is cast in the role of synergos and shepherd as the leading idea of Nestor’s exordium. He also shows how Nestor moves from the significant historical events of Feodosii’s birth, baptism and physical location, to the cosmic allegory of the morning star and the image of the shepherd.
12 Feodosii predicts that he will die on the Saturday as the sun rises (Usp misc, p.128, 63a). In the Povest’ vremennykh let the time is given more precisely as the second hour (col.188). Nestor may be intentionally echoing the symbolic significance of Feodosii meeting the sun, a symbol of the son of righteousness.
13 Among other references see Revelation 22:16, ‘I, Jesus, have sent my angel to give you this testimony for the churches. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, and the bright Morning Star.’
presenting his flock, saying: 'Се, о Владыко, стадо благословенных твоих овец, и имён же им въ пастуха создав, и ныне гласихъ на вѣжествныя твоим пожити, и сих ти приведете славя, чисты и непорочны'. The reply, 'Аще благы, веры умноживши преданный талантъ, тѣмъ же приняшь приготовленный тобѣ вѣнцы и вѣнди въ радость Господа своего', \textsuperscript{14} transports the scene to the setting of the parable of the talents. Having praised Feodosii for increasing his talent, God is seen to turn and address his circle of disciples with words taken from the parable of the sheep and goats. Here Nestor merges two parables which follow one another in the twenty-fifth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel - the parables of the talents and of the sheep and the goats, both of which depict judgement. Using the King's words, 'Come, you who are blessed by my Father; take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink', Nestor quotes them in such a way so that they apply specifically to the monks' labours, 'придѣте благое стадо... иже мною ради умноживше и тщанивше сна, принимаете приготовленое вамъ царствіе въ сложеніи миръ'.\textsuperscript{15} The relevance is made explicit. Nestor urges his audience to imitate Feodosii's life and the lives of the brethren who have already passed on, in anticipation of Christ's words of commendation on the Day of Judgement. Thus at the beginning of the Vita, Feodosii is shown to be an effective intercessor for the brethren on the last day - Christ's co-worker (сдѣвальник), and the Caves Monastery is viewed as the divinely chosen pasture.

These three aspects highlighted in the exordium - Feodosii's effective intercession for his flock, his linking role between heaven and earth, and the Caves Monastery as sacred pasture, - are subsequently developed in the narrative of the Zhittle Feodosiia. During his life Feodosii is depicted as a zealous intercessor who petitions unceasingly for his flock.

\textsuperscript{14} Usp misc, p.74, fol.27c-d
\textsuperscript{15} Usp misc, p.74, fol.27d
A constant refrain throughout the *vita* is the power of Feodosii’s prayers, marked by phrases such as ‘молями пропедевтического их отца и наставника Феодосия’. On a practical level, Nestor records numerous answers to Feodosii’s prayers which meet the needs of the brethren. For example, one wealthy man brings oil in time for the feast of the Theotokos, while on the occasion of Iziaslav’s visit the empty jar of mead is miraculously replenished. To the baker’s astonishment, at Feodosii’s word, he finds empty combins overflowing. Feodosii reminds the baker that God gives according to their needs, if they will only ask, with prayer seen as the natural medium for requests. Nestor uses this as a cue to explain a general principle of Feodosii’s life, faith in God’s care for today. Feodosii’s earnest prayers for his flock are seen as the outworking of this principle, ‘всё же по въся нощи моляще ся къ Богу съ сълзами о стадѣ своемъ’. Nestor then records a prayer which he attributes to Feodosii:

Нако ты н(ын)е владыко съелкупилъ въ мѣсто се, и аще годѣ ти есть жити намѣ въ нымъ, божи намѣ помѣшчичь и податель всѣмъ благымъ, се бо въ има пресебѣтна матерѣ тевонъ вѣдѣжесть бысть домѣ сини, мы же пакы въ тевон има съѣбаны въ нъ. И ты, съѣбди ны и сѣхраннъ съ всаго сюета вѣславлеваго браха и съѣдомы ны посочити вѣчную жызнь, приснѣ же вѣлаги въ сердца наша страха тевон, нако да тѣмь причастишь блага она, наже иготова праведникомъ.

The content of this prayer is not particularly striking, and is designed to illustrate how Feodosii may have prayed many times. Nestor reiterates this point by commenting at the end of the prayer that Feodosii spent all his days in this way, and also taught and comforted the brethren. Thus Feodosii

---

16 *KPP*, p.59
17 *Usp misc.*, p.117, fol.55b
18 *Usp misc.*, p.117, fol.55b-c
is seen to fulfill his role as a shepherd by caring for his flock through prayer and teaching in imitation of Christ. As well as a shepherd, Feodosii is portrayed as a spiritual warrior whose prayers overcome demonic attack. Through prayer Feodosii is seen to dispel the demons troubling the cattle from one of the monastery’s villages. Feodosii’s commitment to his flock is shown not to preclude a lifestyle of personal asceticism. By night he is reported to expose his body to the gnats while chanting the Psalter and every Lent he ostensibly retreats to the confines of a nearby cave to fast and pray. Nestor presents Feodosii as an example of both the cenobitic and ascetic models, committed both to pasturing his flock and to a lifestyle of self-discipline.

Feodosii’s linking role between heaven and earth is based on his life of prayer. In harmony with the monastic ideal Feodosii is depicted as a citizen of heaven and earth, who acts as a bridge between the two worlds through intercession, a visible light radiating the reality of heaven. Jostein Børtnes explores the light visions in the Zhitiye Feodosiia as seen, for example, in the illuminated cave, in the visions culminating in the foundation of the Church and finally in the pillar of fire at Feodosii’s death. He interprets these visions as moments when the heavenly is seen to penetrate the earthly, so that the earthly is ultimately conformed to the heavenly pattern. Knut Grimstad also elucidates the monastery as a symbol which shares in Feodosii’s apotheosis, so that the monastery too

---

19 F. Siefkes unravels three main metaphors which dominate Zhitiye Feodosiia: the shepherd/flock metaphor, and the warrior and light metaphors (Zur Form des Zhitiye Feodosiia, (Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik 12), 1970, pp.100-2). Børtnes also draws attention to Feodosii as shepherd, noting that the image of the shepherd belongs to the stock imagery of hagiography. See Jostein Børtnes, Visions of Glory: Studies in Early Russian Hagiography, (Slavica Norvégica 5), Oslo, 1988, p.49; hereafter Børtnes, Visions.

20 Feodosii is described as a shepherd who pastures his flock ‘в св. Главном, благочестивым и чистым, и нече ж и житий св. в св. Главном и писатель описания’ (Usp misc, p.120, fol.57d).

21 'Преподобный ж естец наш иже ви истынне небесный ангел и небесный человек' (Usp misc, p.88, fol.36d-37a).

22 'Пи истины чадищ, естества свое еси въ св. Главном ви истины' (Usp misc, p.96, fol.42a).

23 Børtnes, Visions, pp.65-75
becomes a visible image of the heavenly kingdom.24 Central to these luminous visions are Feodosii’s prayers. Nestor explains that Feodosii’s prayer and nocturnal vigils were the reason for the monastery’s radiance: 'Сцена ти къ блашенаго отца нашего Феодосия молитва еже къ Богу въ садѣ соньмѣ, и о мѣстѣ томь, и сцено брачни и неслыщеня по вся нещи и тако синаше яко светило преквѣтло въ монастыры томь.' 25 Significantly, Feodosii’s prayers also give rise to the visions concerning the foundation of the new Church of the Theotokos. Here his prayers are seen to make the heavenly perceptible on earth.

Feodosii draws a comparison between the Caves Monastery and the story of Jacob’s ladder, expressing an idea close to a monk’s heart - the Caves Monastery as the gateway to heaven. Nestor encourages his reader to recall Jacob’s words, ‘тѣмъ же есть вѣру нашемъ съ божественнымъ Иаковлемъ рѣши: “иако есть Господь на мѣстѣ сѣмѣ и есть святое мѣсто сѣ и мѣсть ино, въ сѣ домѣ божии и сѣ вратъ небыльныхъ”’. 26 Nestor changes the word ‘awesome’ found in the Biblical text to ‘holy’, one of his favourite epithets which he often uses to describe the Caves Monastery and Feodosii’s flock. In this way, Jacob’s words are seen to apply specifically to the Caves Monastery. Nestor also cites Jacob’s words for another reason. Using the story of Jacob’s ladder he compares the initial inspiration for the new church with St Sabas’ founding of his monastery. Nestor relates how one night as Sabas is praying, he sees a fiery pillar reaching from the sky to a place where he finds a cave. This is to be the site of a glorious monastery (монастырь славный), a description Nestor applies three times to the Caves Monastery. Cyril of Scythopolis, Sabas’ hagiographer, also alludes to the story of Jacob’s ladder, ‘видѣлъ же странныѣй тѣ видѣ и страшнѣй и радостнѣй бысть, помышляющѣ глаголаныя книгами о

25 Usp misc, p.118, fol.56b-c
26 Usp misc, p.118, fol.56b
In both *vitae* prayer is a precondition of the luminous visions, and the story of Jacob’s ladder reveals their respective monasteries as a place where heaven meets earth.

Describing the first miraculous appearance, Nestor refers to Feodosii’s ‘most pure and blameless prayer’ not only as the instrument by which it would be built but also as the subject of the vision. While passing the monastery at night, a certain God-fearing man is reported to have seen a marvellous light shining over it. In the centre of his vision he sees Feodosii standing in the middle of the monastery, hands outstretched and praying fervently to God. The same man is said to have seen a second revelation of a fiery arc distending from the church to the site of the new church. Nestor ascribes a third miraculous appearance to Feodosii’s prayers. He relates how at night certain people living nearby heard the sound of a multitude singing, so they went out to investigate its cause. Above the monastery they claimed to have seen a great light with Feodosii at the head of a cortège of monks, praying and chanting as they processed to the new site and returned. Once again, the figure of Feodosii at prayer dominates the scene, and behind him follow a united chorus of heavenly and earthly worshippers. Nestor observes that when the brothers hear of this miracle, they praise God who glorifies that place and sanctifies it by the prayers of Feodosii. Thus for Nestor the very ground of the monastery is sanctified by prayer, which forms the foundation of the new church. In this way the writer’s boast about the Caves Monastery in the *Povest’ vremennykh let* is shown literally to be

---

27 I. Pomialovskii (ed.), *Zhitie sv. Savvy osvishchennogo sostavlennoe sv. Kirillom Skifopol’skim*, St Petersburg, 1890, p.83
28 ‘Къмъ памятни същества, има бялъ и неподслѣднието отца нашъ Федосий и е първично това най-възпитано мълчане’ (*Usp misc.*, p.117, fol.55d).
30 ‘Нѣщо че тѣ съ мълчането блага и бива имъ пачи чадо писана’ (*Usp misc.*, p.119, col.57a).
true. Rather than founded on silver and influential patrons, the Caves Monastery is seen arise from prayer, fasting, tears and vigils.\(^\text{31}\)

This heavenly reality, however, is not visible to mortal sight unaided by prayer and divine revelation. Although I have used the word ‘vision’ to refer to the heavenly appearances mentioned above, Nestor avoids the word ‘видимок’, a word which can also denote demonic visions. Instead he uses the language of revelation so that the God-fearing man who sees Feodosii at prayer does so by means of revelation - ‘явлениямъ открывъ сѧ’. This sight is described as a miracle (чудо) rather than a vision. Words with the same root as miracle (чудо) intersperse the scene, aligning this experience to the world of miracles rather than dreams. For example, the light over the monstery is described as ‘пречудный’ and the man marvels at this sight (чудаше сѧ). Similar word clusters characterize Nestor’s account of the other miraculous appearances. After the first miracle, the man sees a second (и се иже чудо и явлише сѧ) and a third miracle is shown as a result of Feodosii’s prayers (имея показы чудо показа). Nestor explains that the brethren did not understand the nature of the miracle, since a mystery requires revelation: ‘сѧ же, иже разуметь исть, ангеловъ сице явлившиемъ сѧ быти, имѣже вт брата не единою же сихъ, чудшему Господу сице явлившему и сокрышему отъ сихъ тайнъ сию’.\(^\text{32}\)

When Nestor draws attention to a moment of divine revelation, he often employs the verb ‘разуметь’. What may be misconstrued by an outsider’s gaze, is interpreted by Nestor in the light of revelation.\(^\text{33}\)

The most persuasive evidence of Nestor’s use of revelational language is seen in the story about the monk Damian. The same story is narrated both in the *Povest’ vremennykh let* and in the *Kievo-pecherskii PVLL*, p. 119, fol. 56d

31 *PVLL*, col.159
32 *Usps misc*, p.119, fol.56d
33 In recounting St Sabas’ vision of the fiery pillar as a sign of the site for the new monastery, Nestor links it to the Kievan Caves Monastery by the phrase ‘тако же и сѧ разуметь исть. Боже названный мѣсто тво’ (*Usps misc*, p.118, fol.56b). Nestor comments on Feodosii’s last words and parting expression of joy - ‘ихъ же разуметь исть, иже небесному монахъ видѣ’ (*Usps misc*, p.130, fol.64b).
paterik, but with telling differences. In the Povest’ vremennykh let Damian is characterized by his supernatural gift of healing. In the Zhitiie Feodosiia Nestor naturally elevates Feodosii’s role, and Damian’s gift of healing is not mentioned. Instead he underlines how Damian strove to emulate Feodosii’s life.

According to the chronicler’s account, Damian is about to die when an angel appears in the form of Feodosii, promising him the heavenly kingdom as a reward for his labours. After this angelic appearance Feodosii and the brethren come and sit beside him and Damian reminds his hegumen not to forget what he has promised. Only then does Feodosii realize that Damian has seen a vision, reassuring him that his promise will be granted. In both the chronicle and Patericon accounts, the word ‘видение’ is employed to describe the vision.34

By contrast, in the Zhitiie Feodosiia Nestor avoids the word ‘видение’ and draws attention to the fact that Damian himself realizes he has seen a revelation. The revelation of a transcendent Feodosii is granted in response to Damian’s dying prayer that he will be given the heavenly kingdom, and be united with Feodosii in the life to come - ‘тогда же тв взыграние как видение ут Бога бысть ныне, не бо нег виз взвизи извзвиз, ни паки дѣви визвим взвиз, ны на нём же месте накиц са на томъ же паки и невидимъ бысть’.35 Thus prayer is seen to open the way to heaven, disclosing a more solid and enduring reality. Nestor’s revelations bear a heavenly, post-resurrection reality, temporarily revealed and then withdrawn from sight, yet of greater substance and reality than a vanishing vision.36

Feodosii’s role of intercession is further highlighted in the depiction of his death. His flock and the Caves Monastery occupy his thoughts and

34 [царуялъ въмкъи Феодоси иако виднѣяя визѣлия] (PLL, col.189).
35 Usp misc, p.103, fol.46a-b
36 It recalls the New Testament model of Jesus’ post-resurrection body. Even when the doors are shut, Jesus comes and stands among his disciples. ‘On the evening of that day, the first day of the week, the doors being shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood among them and said to them, “Peace be with you”’ (John 20:19).
prayers until his dying breath. When Feodosii is first told in a revelation that he will die, he calls the brethren together to give them his parting words of instruction. After this he prays fervently for the salvation of his soul, for his flock and for the Caves Monastery (ο σπασονι της Αμαντης και ο Κωνσταντινουπολιτη των Μυστηριων). Again, just before Feodosii dies, one of the brothers observes through a chink in the wall how the saint prays with tears once again for the salvation of his soul, for his flock and the monastery (εν Κωνσταντινουπολιτη των Μυστηριων). By underlining that Feodosii intercedes for ‘his flock’ and ‘that place’, Nestor creates an identity for the Caves Monastery which resides both in a people and a locality.

The manner of Feodosii’s death also strengthens his role as intercessor. Events leading to his final departure echo the Biblical narrative of Christ’s death. When Jesus tells the Jews that they cannot go where he is going, they are perturbed. The brethren of the Caves Monastery are also at first uncertain over how to interpret Feodosii’s intimations of his departure, wondering whether he planned to withdraw and lead a solitary life. After Feodosii has been taken seriously ill he prays, ‘δώσει τον λόγον σε πάντα και θα περιμένω την ομορφιά της ομορφιάς’ After his prayer, Feodosii remains in a state of paralysis, and many assume that he is dead. Three days later he gets up, a period symbolic of resurrection. His closing prayer, said in the light of indescribable revelation, recalls the manner of Christ’s last words on the cross spoken with a loud voice (καὶ πεσάνης γλασώμαι).  

---

37 Usp misc, p.127, fol.62b
38 Usp misc, p.130, fol.64a
39 See John 8:22. Instead of the brothers’ confusion over where Feodosii intends to go, the Kievo-pecherskii paterik presents a different scene. Prince Sviatoslav visits Feodosii who assures him of his prayers and entrusts to him the care of the Kievan Caves Monastery. This appears to be a later insertion.
30 Usp misc, p.127, fol.62c. These words which echo Mary’s response to the angel’s message, Jesus’ passion, and prayers attributed to the martyrs of the early Church, ‘May it be to me as you have said’ (Luke 1:38) and ‘not my will but yours be done’ (Luke 22:42).
31 Usp misc, p.130, fol.64a. See Matthew 27:50, ‘And when Jesus had cried out again in a loud voice, he gave up his spirit’.
At the moment of death Feodosii sees a final revelation, and Nestor portrays his delight at approaching his heavenly home. Feodosii’s last words are said with a look of joy: “Ευορ, αμέ τακο μις το νυκτε νε εο δα, ηα πανε εακα α α μενε ωναν εα με ην λοκα λευκοι ηε Νοκο οιον ποια.” His joy recalls Nestor’s opening picture of Feodosii at the Day of Judgement, when he unhesitatingly presents ‘his children’ to God. Athanasius’ *Life of St Anthony*, one of the prototypes for any monk’s vita, also portrays St Anthony’s joy as he lies dying. Having said farewell to the two brothers who faithfully attended him, Athanasius records that Anthony drew up his feet, ‘and with a look as though friends had come to him and he was overjoyed at the sight of them - for, as he lay there, his face had a cheerful look - he passed away’. Athanasius hints at the cause of Anthony’s joy, the welcome from the company of saints. Nestor too casts a veil over the final scene. Feodosii’s peaceful death would have been reassuring for any future petitioner, admiring of the way he stepped over into the spiritual realm with confidence.

Feodosii’s dying words to his brethren assure them that he will intercede and mediate on their behalf in the face of God’s judgement. His promise also reinforces the notion that the very ground of the Caves Monastery is sacred, imparting salvation to those who live there. First, he promises that he will answer before God for the sins of whoever dies in the monastery or is sent as hegumen elsewhere. But, he adds, if a brother leaves voluntarily he will not be accountable for him. Second, Feodosii makes himself personally answerable for the condition of the monastery. If the monastery prospers, then the brothers should understand that he approaches God with confidence, but if it is in want, that he is far from

---

42 Usp misc, p.130, fol.64a-b
44 Usp misc, p.129, fol.63d
God. Clearly Feodosii anticipated that his role in the life of the monastery would grow rather than diminish after his death.

Following a description of Feodosii's death, Nestor reinforces the truth of his promise to the brethren. He comments on the unexpected plenty enjoyed in the monastery and surrounding villages in the year of Feodosii's death and in his day, attributing it to the power of the saint's prayer. Nestor then reiterates Feodosii's continued participation and position before God by quoting three Biblical passages, the third of which recalls Feodosii's promise to be with them always. This pledge is repeated by Feodosii in the story which follows: the boiar of a prince, who remains anonymous, is reportedly out of favour with him. After he earnestly prays to God and Feodosii, the saint appears to him while he is asleep and asks the boiar why he is upset, and whether he thinks that Feodosii has abandoned them. Then Feodosii reassures the boiar that he will always be with them in spirit, 'ἀλλὰ ἐγὼ καὶ θαλάμησθεν σα μεν υἱῷ, ἵνα δεσμάτων ἐναλλάξων μετὰ σαμίν γέμε.'

Thus Feodosii promises not just his intercession, but guarantees his presence as well, using words modelled on Christ's assurance at the end of Matthew's Gospel 'surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age.' This is in marked contrast to Anthony's parting words to his disciples: 'and now, my children, God bless you; Anthony is going and is with you no more'.

From its inception Feodosii's cult revolved around the twin axes of his person and the place of the Caves Monastery. Thus the monastery became a powerful emblem of national spiritual life for a recently christianized land, one which fostered tangible signs. By comparison, St Anthony's parting words leave his disciples with a spiritual blessing, breaking their tangible link with him.

Nestor also records how during Feodosii's life, he kept in touch with lay people and princes, acting as a spiritual father to those outside the

---

45 Usp misc. p.132, fol.65b
46 Matthew 28:20
47 The Life of St. Anthony, p.96
monastery’s walls. The centre for lay veneration would have gravitated naturally to the new church. From the obscurity of the caves Feodosii’s relics were translated to the church in 1091, providing a more concrete and visible focus for veneration. The writer of the Povest’ vremennykh let entry s.a.1091 includes himself among those who knew Feodosii, and now gaze reverently at his tomb. He cites Ian and Maria as a couple whom Feodosii tended during his life and whose story also enhances the account of his translation. Feodosii prophesies that Maria’s body will be buried near his. This prophecy sees its fulfillment when Maria is buried on the thirteenth of August to the right of Feodosii’s tomb and his relics were translated on the fourteenth. From the tale of this remarkable prophecy the writer concludes that Feodosii was an intercessor not only for the monks and the monastery, but for the whole of Rus’, and for all the faithful who venerated his tomb:

Feodosii’s promise to intercede personally on behalf of the brethren who die in the monastery, is also extended by analogy to include those who were buried in the Church of the Theotokos. This is explicitly stated in the Kievo-pecherskii paterik: ‘блаженъ и токмо бляжень сподвижникъ въ тых написанъ быть, яко остается прияти грехомъ и мады небесныхъ не погубишь’.

Here the power of intercession associated with Feodosii’s promise before he dies, is reproduced in the church.

As well as Nestor’s account of how the church was founded through prayer and visions, the first tales in the Kievo-pecherskii paterik narrate how its foundation was inspired by a layman - the fugitive Varangian

---

48 PVLL, col.212-3  
49 KPP, p.9
Shimon, renamed Simon after his conversion to the Orthodox faith. Before Feodosii’s death Simon prostrates himself before the saint, begging him to bless his soul even after they are both dead. Despite Feodosii’s mild protest that he cannot be sure this prayer will be granted, Simon insists that Feodosii’s intercession will be effective. Simon recalls the voice he heard in his first revelation, which told him to give the crown to a saint who would build a church to the Theotokos. In response to Simon’s pleading, Feodosii offers a sign, which, he promises, will become evident after his death and will tell Simon whether his prayer has been answered. Just as in the Zhite Feodosii Feodosii makes the wellbeing of the monastery a sign of his effective intercession, so here he regards the state of the church as a measure of his confidence (Ἀρετή) before God to intercede on Simon’s behalf.  

Simon then begs Feodosii not only to pray for him and his son Georgii, but also for his family to the last generation, just as he prayed for his monks. Feodosii agrees, promising to pray for all who love ‘this holy place’ for his sake. Clearly Simon’s anxious request paves the way for a wider audience. Lastly, Simon asks Feodosii to record his promise in writing. ‘προσφέραντα θυσίαν τουτού χορήγησαν τοὺς τεκτόνους τῆς καθοδήγησεν καὶ εὐαγγέλιζεν’ (KPP, p.4).  

The identity of the prayer ‘Ἐν οἴνοις οἴκους καὶ σημεία καὶ Σώζων Θεοῦ’ is puzzling. Makarii assumes that the prayer began with the words ‘in the name of the Father...’ but notes that this does not correspond to the prayer for the dying used in the liturgy of his own day. Golubinskii shares

---

50 Feodosii says to Simon, ‘Ανάμεσα μεταξύ μοινὶ και έντυμμα έναντι και μη μοινὶ εξομολογήσεις ότι με τους κτησίβις καὶ έναντι μοινὶ τοιαύτης της καθοδήγησεν ούτως και απαντήσεις’ (KPP, p.4). In Greek τριγυσία is a technical term of intercession, translated by ‘Ἀρετή’, and can be read as the boldness, confidence, assurance or licence with which one speaks, or intercedes on another’s behalf. See Harold K. Moulton, The Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised, Michigan, 1977, p.311.

51 KPP, p.4.

52 Makarii, Istoriia russkoi tserkvi, II, pp.131-2. He notes that from the days of the early Church a prayer was read over the dying. He assumes that from the time of Feodosii, after the prayer was read over the deceased, it began to be placed in their hands.
Makarii’s uncertainty as to whether the current burial prayer is the work of Feodosii, or whether a new prayer subsequently replaced it. Judging by Abramovich’s annotated edition, only the Second Cassian redaction records the title ‘ЕБ НЕСИ ОТЦА И СЫНА И СВЕТОГО ДУХА’. Was this a later insertion? One hint that the writer does not equate Feodosii’s prayer for Simon with the prayer placed in the hands of the departed, is his reference to ‘such’ a prayer, rather than to ‘this’ prayer. He simply observes that they place such a prayer (такову молитву) into the hands of the deceased. He also describes the text of Feodosii’s prayer for Simon as an example rather than necessarily a replica of his prayer, ‘и оттое утлесан бакосе манисанне полагаии умершины, прежде его имъ не сътвори сицерва вещи к Руын’. The significant point of comparison emerges as these things’, the custom of placing the prayer in the hands of the departed, not the words of the prayer. By contrast when the writer refers specifically to the prayer Feodosii composed for Simon he uses the pronoun ‘this’ - ‘сие еб молитве’ and ‘сие молитве’. Simon evidently wanted to face death holding Feodosii’s prayer. In the discourse on the decoration of Feodosii’s coffin, Georgii, Simon’s son, relates how his father instructed him to place the prayer in his hands on his deathbed. From this incident apparently sprang the tradition of placing a written prayer of intercession in the hands of the deceased. Although a closer reading of the text suggests that the prayer in contemporary usage was not the same one Feodosii wrote for Simon, the fact that he is...

53 E.E. Golubinskii, Istoriia russkoi tserkvi, I, 2nd edn, Moscow, 1901, 1, pp.839-40
54 KPP, p.4
55 KPP, p.4. The second reference is found in manuscripts Abramovich labels A and O.
56 Burial rites from ancient times often entailed placing objects with the deceased. For example, a coin was given to the deceased with which to pay the fare to Charon, the ferryman who was thought to take the dead across the rivers Styx or Acheron to Hades in classical times. Later, Christians wished to die with the eucharist in their mouths, a practice which was condemned by the Church. According to Ethiopian tradition, a ‘bandlet of righteousness’ (Lefafa Tsedek), a parchment inscribed with a mixture of prayers and magical formulae, was wound around the body. This was thought to have been given by Christ to Mary for use as a safeconduct when the departed made their perilous journey after death. See Geoffrey Rowell, The Liturgy of Christian Burial, London, 1977, pp.14-44.
associated with such a custom bears witness to people’s faith in his role as intercessor and mediator on their behalf.

Feodosii’s prayer for Simon is based on two well-known Biblical passages about forgiveness and the Day of Judgement - the plea of the dying thief, and the king’s appraisal of his servants. Simon is not satisfied until Feodosii agrees to intercede for his parents and kinsfolk that their sins too may be forgiven. Feodosii’s blessing, like his prayer, is a mosaic of Biblical quotations, “АЛЯ БЛАГОСЛАВИТЬ ТЯ ГОСПОДЬ ОТ СИОНА, И УЗРИТЕ БЛАГА ИРУСАЛИМУ ВО ВСЕЙ ЖИЗНИ ТЕЯ ВАШЕГО И ДО ПОСЛЕДНИХ РОДА ВАШЕГО”. Evidently Simon’s faith in Feodosii was not invested in the originality of his words but in the power of his intercession. A written record was undoubtedly more attractive as a tangible guarantee of intercession. Georgii, despite being relocated to Suzdal’, also leaves his descendants a written testament strengthening the family’s link with the Caves Monastery.

Georgii elucidates the reason for writing this testament with the following remark:

"Сего ради пишу епископу сию посланному реду синему, да видите же отлучень буди дону поставлень владыческа Богородица и преподобных Антония и Феодосия. Аще ли кто и в посланное увещанье приндет, не может что дати, да поне в селых церкви тея положень будеть, вездь бо молите Антониева и Феодосиева засступает." 59

His letter serves as a record, guaranteeing the right of their family to be buried near the Caves Monastery, albeit in the surrounding villages. By sending a gift to the monastery of five hundred grivna of silver and fifty of

57 "Пишем миꙗ, Господа, идущихъ Царствъ ихъ и давати хотя комужде по дадаше Господа, тогда убо, владыча, и реда сего Симона и Георгія сподвии оденую течь стати въ олхъ твои и слышаи благий твоя глас: "придеть благославлений отца моего посладуйте угождение благ царство инпин мира" (КПП, п.4). Cf. ‘Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom’ (Luke 23:42) and ‘Then the King will say to those on his right, “Come, you who are blessed by my Father; take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world” (Matthew 25:34).
58 KPP, p.4. ‘May the Lord bless you from Zion all the days of your life; may you see the prosperity of Jerusalem, and may you live to see your children’s children’ (Psalm 128:5,6).
59 KPP, p.86
gold toward the decoration of Feodosii’s tomb, he appears to be following in the footsteps of his father whose handsome donation won him a burial place in the church (according to the first discourse of the Kievo-pecherskii paterik Simon was the first person to be buried in the Church of the Theotokos).

Georgii uses another story to illustrate the power of Feodosii’s prayer over the surrounding villages. He recounts how one of the villages attached to the Caves Monastery was miraculously spared bloodshed in a battle because it was supernaturally protected by Feodosii’s prayer - a prerogative extended to all those associated with the monastery. Protection by association reinforces the idea that Feodosii’s intercession is effective beyond the monastery walls. Georgii assures his descendants that they are all inscribed in Feodosii’s prayer, ‘и сего ради пишу вам, яко вы написаны въ молитву святаго Феодосия, тый бо обещает отцу моему Симонови, яко же о своих черноязычих, тако и о насъ молитися’. The efficacy of Feodosii’s promise is confirmed to Georgii by his father’s message of reassurance, which is communicated to one of the monks in a dream. Lest one of Simon’s progeny scorn the power of Feodosii’s prayer and blessing, Georgii attaches a warning, ‘кто же ли не ехщетъ молитвы и благословения святаго отца Феодосия и от него уклонится, ехщетъ же казнѣ, и да придетъ ему’. By the time of Georgii’s great-grandchildren, likely contemporaries of Simon and Polikarp, the connection with Kiev is by extension. St Demetrius, presumably a local church in Suzdal’, has become the place of reverence to which the family is connected. Faith in Feodosii’s prayers and promise is now expressed in devotion to St Demetrius, but rejecting his intercession is tantamount to welcoming a curse.

И сего ради пишу вам, яко вы написаны въ молитву святаго Димитрия, ть бо наимою место свое въ немъ, и иже аще кто ихъ лишится, и синъ подъ казнью суть своих

60 KPP, p.86
61 KPP, p.86
The underlying thrust of the discourse on the decoration of Feodosii’s tomb points to the reward of being devoted to Feodosii, and the dire consequences of belittling his intercession. By the early thirteenth century, more recent and nearer monasteries and churches may have been in danger of diverting the devotion and wealth of Simon’s offspring away from the Caves Monastery. Georgii’s letter may have acted as a spur to remain faithful to the Caves Monastery.

The passing of time is either friend or foe to a saint’s veneration. Whereas Feodosii’s veneration seems relatively secure, Antonii was a different matter. One sign that Antonii was not venerated with the same zeal as Feodosii is the absence of any full-length vita along the lines of Nestor’s Zhitie Feodosiia. There is no mention in the Povest' vremennykh let of the date of Antonii’s death, his burial, posthumous miracles or nascent cult. Only the entry s.a.1051 gives an account of how Antonii started the Caves Monastery, conferring on it a blessing from the Holy Mount. The Kievo-pecerskii paterik refers to a ‘Life of Antonii’ seven times. At first scholars assumed this work was the missing vita of Antonii, but thanks mainly to Bosley’s efforts, these seven references have been shown to be misleading. Once the Caves Monastery was firmly established, the

---

62 KPP, p.86
63 Shakhmatov argues that the second Cassian redaction of the Kievo-pecerskii paterik contains an expanded version of the Povest' vremennykh let entry s.a.1051, which the editor wrote after acquiring new information gleaned from a copy of the ‘Life of Antonii’. This work, Shakhmatov assumes, was lost after its inclusion in the second Cassian redaction. See A.A. Shakhmatov, Razyskaniia o drevneishikh russkikh letopisnykh svodakh, St Petersburg, 1908. Subsequently, the expanded version of the 1051 entry has been shown to contain no new information, but represents an attempt to harmonize internal contradictions.
64 Muriel Heppell examines the references made to the ‘Life of Antonii’ in the Kievo-pecerskii paterik. She demonstrates that one of the tales which refers to the ‘Life of Antonii’, the discourse on Mosei the Hungarian, is of earlier origin and on this basis dates the beginnings of the monastery to the early 1030s, rather than to 1051 (the date chosen by the compiler of the Povest' vremennykh let). From this, she surmises that the ‘Life of Antonii’ is a more valuable source of history for the origins of Kievan monasticism than the Zhitie Feodosiia. See M. Heppell, “The ‘Vita Antonii’ a lost source of the ‘Paterikon’ of the Monastery of Caves’, Byzantinoslavica, 1, 1952, (hereafter Heppell, “Vita Antonii”), pp.46-58. Bosley points out, however, that the seven
question of Antonii’s veneration became more pressing, after all he was the
original founder of the monastery. By the time Simon and Polikarp
compiled the *Kievo-pecherskii paterik*, there was evidently greater concern
to form a composite identity for the Caves Monastery which resided in
Antonii and Feodosii and all the monks who had since lived and died in the
monastery. An identity based on the power of their intercession provided a
natural link between the two founders and the company of monks.

Antonii’s role is depicted foremost as the initiator of the Caves
Monastery. The *Povest’ vremennykh let* entry s.a.1051 emphasizes how
Antonii set apart the Caves Monastery by conferring on it the blessing from
the Holy Mount.65 Repeatedly the writer draws attention to the blessing of
the Holy Mount, and when a number of disciples have gathered, he once
again underlines that Antonii confers on them the blessing, first from God
and second, from the Holy Mount.66 The monastery is perceived to have
arisen from the blessing of the Holy Mount, ‘а въ томъ предвѣстіе Печерскаго
манастыря, есть же манастырь Печерскій втѣ благословений Святая Горы птиѣль’.67
Thus Antonii’s blessing is seen to distinguish the monastery from all the
other monasteries in Rus’. Thereafter the focus switches to Feodosii.

Discourses which refer to the ‘Life of Antonii’ are not about Antonii but other monks of the
monastery. Not one, he observes, alludes to Antonii’s ascetic life, his teaching, death or miracles
- essential reading in a vita. Secondly, he finds no early South Slav manuscript which shows that
Antonii was venerated as a saint in the Kievan period. Not until around 1400 does he find
manuscript evidence of Antonii’s veneration in East Slav manuscripts. Significantly, the
synaxarion reading for Antonii consists of the chronicler’s entry s.a.1051 rather than a separate
vita. This fact suggests to Bosley that there never was a vita of Antonii which conformed to the
traditional pattern. See Richard Bosley, *A History of the Veneration of SS. Theodosij and Antonij
of the Kievan Caves Monastery from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Century*, Ph.D. thesis, Yale
University, 1980 (hereafter Bosley, *A History*).

65 Although Francis Thomson suggests that this refers to a monastery called the Holy Mount
which is situated on a promontory south of Vladimir in Volhynia, Mt Athos would be assumed by
most readers. See F. Thomson, ‘Saint Anthony of Kiev - the facts and the fiction’, (forthcoming in

66 ‘Боже въ насъ вѣстись избранни и втѣ благословѣнны есть Святая Горы, имены менѣ построены игумены Святая
Горы, а нынѣ есѧ птиѣль, да буду благословены на вѣкъ предвѣстіе втѣ Бога, а етѣри втѣ Святая Горы’ (*PVLL*,
col.157). When Antonii comes across Iarion’s cave, he prays that God will establish him there,
and that the blessing of the Holy Mount will be on that place: ‘и да будетъ на мѣстѣ въ
благословеный Святая Горы и много игумена’ (*PVLL*, col.157).

67 *PVLL*, col.159
Significantly, although the Caves Monastery is often called ‘Feodosii’s monastery’, it is not referred to as ‘Antonii’s monastery’.  

Apart from the entry s.a. 1051, there is little written in the early sources about Antonii. Simon and Polikarp, as well as the later editors of the *Kievo-pecerskii paterik*, faced the task of giving Antonii a fitting role. As well as being founder of the monastery, Antonii is made a co-founder of the Church of the Theotokos. In this respect the first four discourses about the founding of the church helped, but evidently they offer an embellished rendering of events rather than a reliable source.  

In the *Kievo-pecerskii paterik* account Antonii merely gives his initial blessing on the church’s foundation and, according to the third discourse (an attempt to tie together the various strands concerning the church’s foundation), prays over the future site. Assuming Antonii died two years before Feodosii’s own death in 1074, he would have had no part in the construction of the church which only began in 1073. By a literary sleight of hand, however, Antonii becomes a founder of the church before it is built, and Antonii and Feodosii authorize the work of the icon painters after their death. In two visions, one

\[\ldots\]

---

68 In the *Zhitie Feodosiiia* Nestor constantly refers to it as the ‘monastery of blessed Feodosii.’ When he describes his own connection with the Pecherskii monastery, he writes of being ‘


70 When Antonii chooses the site for the church he asks, firstly, for the site to be dry with dew on the ground, and secondly, for the earth to be dry with dew covering the new site. Nestor, however, does not mention Antonii’s presence at the founding of the church in the *Zhitie Feodosiiia*. In order to harmonize with the earlier reference to Antonii’s role, the writer of the *Kievo-pecerskii paterik* adds an extra word of explanation to the text of the *Zhitie Feodosiiia*: ‘

71 ‘В о ж д а х а в о м а е н а е т ся црквь Печерскую Ингуманом Федором, и описаним Михайлом и митрополиту Георгию’ (*PVL*, col.183). From this reference the writer of the second discourse could have surmised that Antonii was dead by this time and therefore it would be reasonable to assume that Feodosii died in the second year after Antonii (*KPP*, p.6).
reportedly seen by the craftsmen and the other by the icon painters, Antonii and Feodosii commission the work on the church. In a vision to the craftsmen, the Theotokos apparently warns them that they will not see Antonii since he will only bless the work, 'сін Антоній, тобі благослове, отходити свєта сего на вчнй'. This conveniently explains his absence at the founding of the church. When the icon painters arrive at the Caves Monastery they demand to see the two men who commissioned their work. They realise they have seen a vision, only when an icon of the saints is produced and they recognize them as the men who commissioned their work. A unique feature of these tales is the way Antonii and Feodosii literally act and speak in unison. By comparison with early accounts in which they operate separately, here their identity seems artificially merged.

Together with Feodosii, Antonii is also portrayed in the Kievo-pecherskii paterik as an intercessor of the Caves Monastery. A comparison of the chronicler’s four tales about four early monks with the rendering in the Kievo-pecherskii paterik (here the tale of Isaakii is separated from the other three), shows how later editors widened the focus to include Antonii. In the Povest' vremennykh let the monks are described as the flock gathered by Feodosii. The writer begins and finishes his interlude about the four monks with the remark, 'таці ти ємша черноризці... монастира'. In his concluding remarks he describes how Feodosii’s prayers safeguard his contemporaries. Feodosii’s intercession plays a key role in the tales of Damian and Isaakii. For example, when the demons taunt Isaakii after his recovery from their earlier assault, he is portrayed as shielding himself with the Lord Jesus Christ and with Feodosii’s prayers. By contrast, in the rendering of the tales in the Kievo-pecherskii paterik the gathering of the

72 KPP, p.6
73 твийня стада, няк въ овдопользь Федосих (PVLL, col.188).
74 PVLL, col.198
75 'И послушани на славу Ейу екваториалю и Федосихам бистреми бізкідьх, какаре алка въ вчнй.' (PVLL, col.198).
76 Isaakii says to them: 'на монастыі оця мого Федосих надвйка' (KPP, p.188).
monks is attributed to the Lord rather than specifically to Feodosii.\textsuperscript{77} Antonii’s name is also inserted in the conclusion, ‘на славу всемогущему Богу и пречистей его матери, и святых отец Antonia и Feodosia молитвами свяждающими’.\textsuperscript{78}

These minor changes are evidence of a trend which characterizes the \textit{Kievopecherskii paterik} - the converging roles of Antonii and Feodosii. Simon and Polikarp had an interest evidently not just in Feodosii, but in Antonii and the other monks. In the earlier accounts (from the eleventh to twelfth centuries) Feodosii’s distinctive role as intercessor is complemented by Antonii’s position as the one who initiates and blesses. By the time Simon and Polikarp are writing in the first half of the thirteenth century, and certainly by the time editorial work is conducted in the fifteenth century, a shift in perception is evident through the use of a fixed formula addressing Antonii and Feodosii as joint intercessors. By this time there is also a greater awareness of the heritage derived from the whole company of monks who have lived and died in the monastery.

Simon’s attachment to the monastery is seen in his rebuke to Polikarp that he should even contemplate leaving the monastery. He writes that surely it befits Polikarp to weep, since he abandoned a monastery of such holy fathers and monks, ‘честный монастырь. Печерский святых отец Antonia и Feodosia Печерских и святых отец чёрноризец, иже с ними’.\textsuperscript{79} In memorable words Simon sums up his own devotion to the Kievan Caves Monastery. The glory of being bishop he likens to dirt, for he vows that he would rather be swept up with the dung in the Kievan Caves Monastery and trampled on, or be among the poor before the sacred gates, than be forced to

\textsuperscript{77} ‘Бе в естинему пределе не видети, естине, слазети въ Господь таки чёрноризец въ центном матери своя.’ (\textit{KPP}, p.94). Possibly this opening line has been inserted by a later editor, as a variant reading based on Abramovich’s so-called main redaction (O) is different.

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{KPP}, p.189. Repeated allusions to Antonii alongside Feodosii are, I suggest, the work of a later editor. Abramovich notes variations between the various redactions. In the O redaction, this section resembles more closely the reading found in the \textit{Povest’ vremennykh let}. It omits ‘Богу и пречистей его матери и святых отец Antonia’ and preserves the reference to Feodosii’s prayers ‘и святых молитвами’ (\textit{KPP}, p.189). The Arsenian redaction also reveals differences and contains only the stories about Damian and Jeremei.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{KPP}, p.100
leave the monastery. He asks Polikarp where else such miracles have been performed, or such fathers shone forth. At the end of his letter, he underlines his faith in both Antonii and Feodosii: "и се ти, брате, скажи, что ради мои тщани и вера къ святому Антонию и Феодосию." 80

As well as linking Antonii and Feodosii as co-founders and co-intercessors, a separate tale in discourse fifteen, is devoted to Antonii in the role of intercessor. Simon says that he has heard the tale from the elders who heard it from eye-witnesses. Evidently the tale does not belong to the earlier written sources, and takes place when Pimen is hegumen, possibly in the second half of the twelfth century. 81 The story tells how a foul stench comes from the place where the body of Onisifor’s spiritual son has just been buried. Through a series of dreams Antonii rebukes Onisifor for allowing a man who had led such a sinful life to be buried in the cave alongside him and the brethren. Once Onisifor and Pimin have decided to remove the offending brother, Antonii appears again to Onisifor and says: 

"Смилияйся душа брата сего, понеже не могу преступить свeta моего, еже къ вам объясяся, яко всяяя положенный да помилован быть, аще и грызень есть." 82 No other source hints that Antonii made this promise which strongly recalls Feodosii’s last promise to the monks in Nestor’s Zhitie Feodosiia. Antonii’s reference to the other holy brethren buried in the cave suggests that he is speaking some time after the monastery was first founded. He reasons that if God was willing to spare a city for the sake of twenty righteous men in Abraham’s day, how much more will he have mercy on those who die in the monastery for the sake of Antonii and the holy company buried with him. This argument represents a development in the thinking behind the promise of salvation for those who die in the Caves Monastery. Intercession is seen to be made not just by Feodosii, but also by Antonii in the company of

80 KPP, p.103
81 Muriel Heppell suggests that Pimin, who died in 1182, could have been Polikarp’s predecessor (The Paterik, p.120, n.370).
82 KPP, p.105
monks who have died. Furthermore, the fact that the sinning brother was buried in a cave reinforces the idea that the caves too were a sacred burial ground, a fact possibly overshadowed by the Church of the Theotokos where Feodosii lay interred. Presumably Antonii’s relics were never found and translated, and therefore were not a source of veneration like Feodosii’s relics. It suggests that this story may have been designed to bolster the flagging veneration of Antonii. In an aside to Archimandrite Akindin, Polikarp hints at the fading veneration of Antonii’s life and labours, ‘Διεσπερασε, κακο προμάλλωσε, μην γνωσθει το μνημείο του αυτού πατέρα του Μωυσή’.

An extension of Feodosii’s role as intercessor may have seemed the best chance of reviving his veneration among the people of Rus’ at the time when Simon and Polikarp were writing. How successful was the adjustment of Antonii’s role to that of intercessor? Kirill of Turov, writing in the twelfth century, calls Feodosii, ‘σκληρό προμάλλωσε, θερίζει το κράτος τού Θεοτόκου και το Μοναστήρι του Μωυσή’.

Clearly Feodosii’s reputation as intercessor in the face of judgement was thriving, even if, in this instance, Antonii was left out. Although Antonii may not have acquired his role of intercessor with the same rapidity as Feodosii, the attempt to merge their identities into a common one of intercessor, speaks of the power of Feodosii’s role as intercessor and the image of the Cave Monastery and the Church of the Theotokos as a place of intercession.

First and foremost, the Caves Monastery was perceived as a place of prayer. While Antonii came with the blessing from the Holy Mount, it was

---

83 This reading is from the Arsenian redaction. By the time of the second Cassian redaction both saints are mentioned, ‘Διεσπερασε, κακο προμάλλωσε, μην γνωσθει το μνημείο του αυτού πατέρα του Μωυσή’ (KPP, p.132).
84 Gebete, Saturday Matins, p.337
85 Richard Bosley traces how Antonii was finally venerated in his own right as an ascetic and mystic in the fifteenth century. He suggests that a move toward hesychasm and a renewed interest in links with Byzantium reinvigorated the cult of Antonii. In 1460 he notes that Archbishop Iona of Novgorod commissioned Pakhomii the Serb to write an office for Antonii. See Bosley, A History, pp.144-52
Feodosii who turned the monastery downside up, transforming the inconspicuous group of cave-dwelling ascetics into a prominent symbol of spiritual life. Nestor’s *Zhitie Feodosiia* captures the distinctive marks of the monastery’s identity which would later be developed and up-dated, but not radically reshaped. First, Feodosii and the Caves Monastery are seen to be not an inferior copy of a superior Greek, Syrian or Egyptian monastic model, but a unique phenomenon among the community of Christian nations. Precisely because of the comparatively late conversion of Rus’, Feodosii and the monastery are perceived to be all the more remarkable, providing spiritual light not just for Rus’ but globally. In this respect, Feodosii’s life of intercession was regarded as a spiritual landmark for Rus’.

Second, the Caves Monastery expressed what dominated the spirituality of Rus’ - the life of the heavenly kingdom glimpsed on earth. Through a life of prayer heavenly reality is seen to break through the earthly in the *Zhitie Feodosiia*. This is apparent in a series of revelations granted as a result of Feodosii’s intercession, concerning the founding of the Church of the Theotokos. Nestor views this revealed reality not as a fleeting vision, but as a more solid and enduring reality than offered by the visible world.

Third, Feodosii’s promise to mediate for those who died in the monastery meant that the very ground of the monastery became the ground of salvation. By linking the monastery’s condition to his position before God, he further guaranteed his continued veneration by successive generations of monks. With his promise to be present in spirit, he stepped beyond the role of intercessor and took on the role of mediator after the model of Christ. In this way the monastery and church are revealed as sacred ground, and Feodosii’s prayer the direct link with heaven.

The destiny of baptized Rus’ was no longer confined to the life of this world, but ultimately was to be realized in life after death. Before entering the after-life the individual still had to face judgement. In this respect Feodosii presented an unparalleled asset to the monks and the
people of Rus’. Lay people shared Feodosii’s promise of intercession in a
number of different ways. For those who had known him personally, like
Simon and Maria, there was the opportunity to be buried in the Church of
the Theotokos alongside him. Simon also secured a written prayer from
Feodosii and ordered that it be placed in his hands at his death. A closer
reading of the discourse suggests that the writer was not claiming that the
prayer written by Feodosii was the same one used in his day, as has been
previously assumed, merely that he initiated this custom which was thought
to be unique to Rus’. Behind Feodosii’s role as intercessor and mediator lay
the thought of Judgement Day, a concern which preoccupied the religious
thinking of Rus’, in particular the monastic chapter. Any tangible comfort,
whether Feodosii’s relics in the church or a written prayer placed in the
hands of the deceased, was prized in this context.

Georgii’s testament is also used as a guarantee of Feodosii’s
intercession for his family. No longer connected exclusively with the Caves
Monastery, Feodosii’s intercession is seen to be effective in the surrounding
villages and by extension even in distant Suz’dal, providing that he is still
honoured. Simon and Polikarp, the compilers of the *Kievo-pecherskii
paterik* were faced with the challenge of forming a homogenous identity for
the monastery which included Antonii and all the brethren, as well as
Feodosii. Here, I suggest, they had the task of compensating for the
emphasis on Feodosii’s reputation as intercessor, which characterizes all but
one of the early accounts of the Caves Monastery. Antonii’s role is
strengthened in a number of ways, for example by elaborating his part in the
founding of the new church, by inserting his name alongside Feodosii’s as
cointercessor, and adding a tale devoted to the power of his intercession. In
this way Simon and Polikarp’s composite work not only recorded the
spiritual diary of the monastery, but also developed it as a place renowned
for the power of its intercession, rising from its founders and the monks
who died and were buried there. At the heart of the identity of the Caves
Monastery lay the power of intercession by holy men dwelling on holy ground - perceived to be a ladder to heaven.
Vladimir Monomakh’s prayers and spirituality

By the time of Prince Vladimir Monomakh Rus’ was more established as a Christian nation but was beset by familial conflicts involving the sins of the fathers and their children. No longer was one decisive act by a single ruler, such as Vladimir I’s baptism, sufficient. Required were political and moral principles by which a family of squabbling and allegedly Christian princes could live united as one people. In the Pouchenie these principles can be discerned in the prayerful meditation from the Psalter and in brief prayers which intersperse the work.

The Pouchenie opens by describing a moral dilemma. Monomakh narrates how once messengers from his kinsmen rode up to him, urging him to join their attack on the Rostislavichi, and threatening that if he holds back he would have to fend for himself. Monomakh’s response to the invitation to break his oath and encroach on his cousins’ territory is expressed through the words of the Psalter, which I will treat as material for prayer. Although I recognize that it could be argued that the extracts from the Psalter do not relate to the subject of prayer, there is reason to treat them as prayer. In the Judaic tradition and from the days of the early Church the Psalter was used as a prayer book and in the Middle Ages continued to enjoy undiminished popularity. It is difficult to over-estimate the impact of the Psalter on the medieval Christian mind and for Monomakh its centrality would have been self-evident. Here Monomakh evidently turns to it at a moment of crisis in

---

1 Monomakh assumes a knowledge of the liturgy and Psalter on the part of his reader. Three times in the Pouchenie he uses the shorthand ‘преда’ after Biblical quotations, indicating that either he expected his reader to continue from memory, or at least have access to look them up. In the first instance Monomakh cites the verse in the Psalter which struck him, “Εσώρη θηλασία ψυχήσιν αυτής; Εσώρη σοφάσίζωνι μα’ εν πράγμα”. At the end of his selection of extracts from the Psalter ‘преда’
his life, his eyes alighting on the verse: 'Еще писанна ки, яким мол? Ескую саняинки мак? Фуюра на Бога, яким исповдаса наму'.\(^2\) The psalmist's cry is not addressed directly to God but records his inner dialogue, designed to lift his soul to God and spoken before God. In this sense I shall consider the extracts from the Psalter as both prayer and meditation. Otherwise, prayers are hardly marked in the text and do not begin in a conventional way by invoking God and closing with 'amen'. A more formal prayer which follows the letter to Oleg, previously attributed by critics to Monomakh, has been shown to be of later origin.\(^3\)

One drawback to any study of the *Pouchenie* is the fact that only one copy survives inserted s.a.1096 in the *Povest' vremennykh let* of the Laurentian redaction. Whereas Monomakh's letter of forgiveness to his cousin relates clearly to the events of 1096, after Oleg killed Iziaslav Monomakh's son, the *Pouchenie* is harder to date. The opening incident dates to before Monomakh's reign as prince of Kiev, while the last record of Monomakh's military and hunting engagements can be dated 1117.\(^4\) Various suggestions have been mooted about the time of composition. There has been considerable debate over whether the phrase 'на далеки пути да на санех' should be understood literally as a distant winter's journey, or, as a metaphor for old age when man is approaching the time for his body to be carried to burial 'на санех' and his soul taken to a distant

---

\(^2\) *PVL,* col.241

\(^3\) A.I. Musin-Pushkin, *Dukhovnaia velikogo kniaza Vladimir Vsevolodovicha Monomaka detiam svoim, nazvannaia v letopisi suzdal'skoi Pouchienie,* St Petersburg, 1793, doubted that Monomakh wrote the final prayer. R. Mat'esen (Mathiesen), 'Tekstologcheskie zamechaniia o proizvedeniakh Vladimira Monomakha', *TODL,* 26, 1971, pp.192-201, offers a convincing refutation of Monomakh's authorship of the prayer. Although at least two thirds of the prayer consists of extracts from the Lenten liturgy, he identifies one fragment which derives from a prayer canon by Kirill of Turov. Bearing in mind the originality of the canon and the likelihood of Kirill's authorship, Mathiesen points out that it is highly improbable Monomakh would have had a chance to hear or read it before his death in 1125.
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place. Shliakov pins down the date to the ninth of February 1106, while Monomakh was journeying to Rostov and writing under the influence of the Lenten readings. I propose to dispute the view that Monomakh is governed foremost by the Lenten mood of the excerpts from the Psalter. Likhachev, agreeing with the view that Monomakh composed the Pouchenie in old age, points out that the reference to a literal distant journey does not explain why the writer should see himself as someone whom the reader can dismiss as talking nonsense (безрассудно). I would add in support of this view, that two other outbursts of praise for God’s care, one found at the beginning (покаян и отречся и душею грешного допредел), and the other near the end (хвалю Бога и прославлю многество ибо, иже ма грешного и хвалю селкое аще скажа, ит тебе чась смертных), also corroborate the impression of the writer’s advanced years. In this case, it appears that while Monomakh’s initial inspiration may have come from the events of 1099, his final editing or record was finished in 1117, or even in 1125 when Monomakh was past seventy. In view of the Pouchenie’s disjointed shape, Fennell goes so far as to suggest that it may have been put together for the first time by Lavrentii in 1377. Refuting this opinion, I will illustrate how the Pouchenie shows more evidence of being compiled with intentionality rather than haphazardly as has been assumed in the past. Whether Monomakh

---

5 Likhachev draws attention to the parallel with Feodosii who is placed on a sledge when he is dying, and from there he explains his final testament. See V.P. Adrianova-Peretts et al. (eds), Povest’ vremennykh let, II, Moscow-Leningrad, 1950, (hereafter Povest’, II), pp.433-4. V.A. Voskresenskii, Pouchenie detiam Vladimira Monomakha, St Petersburg, 1893, p.271, on the other hand, argues that the Pouchenie was composed in 1099 while Monomakh was travelling to Rostov and the events thereafter were added later by Monomakh or by the chronicler in 1118. He pays particular attention to the phrase ‘и а иные ины Ростовъ’.


7 PVLL, col.241

8 PVLL, col.251-2

9 Dimitri Obolensky, Six Byzantine Portraits, Oxford, 1988, pp.102-3, supposes that Monomakh wrote his autobiography in 1117 after the last of his labours mentioned in the Pouchenie, but suggests that his initial inspiration came from the events of 1099. Istrin assumes that Monomakh wrote his work in 1125 when he was past seventy as a kind of testimony inspired by death’s approach. For a summary of earlier views on this question see Likhachev, Povest’, II, pp.430-4.

10 Fennell, Early Russian Literature, pp.64-79.
composed the *Pouchenie* in stages and then re-edited it at the end of his life, or compiled it in its present form just before his death, is of secondary importance.

When was the *Pouchenie* inserted s.a.1096 in the Laurentian redaction, and why? The *Pouchenie* shows all the marks of being added after the initial stages of the chronicle’s compilation. Monomakh’s exploits end in 1117 and therefore do not strictly belong s.a.1096. Scholars have offered various explanations. If the *Pouchenie* finishes in 1117 and the chronicle ends 1110 with Sil’vestr’s postscript dated 1116, then Shakhmatov supposes the third editor of *Povest' vremennykh let* was biased toward Monomakh and added the *Pouchenie* in 1118 when a third redaction was compiled. Voronin takes his cue from the state in which the text of the *Pouchenie* survives. There is a lacuna of four and a half lines at the beginning of the text and no clear division between this first work and the letter to Oleg which follows. This fact, Voronin argues, points to the existence of an independent manuscript which contained a collection of Monomakh’s works in which the first folio was damaged by frequent use. He assumes that such a manuscript existed for some time apart from the chronicle, and, that judging by the single copy which survives, was not widely available. If it had been included in the *Povest' vremennykh let*, then he argues it would have appeared in other redactions. By attributing the prayer which follows Monomakh’s letter to Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii, Voronin proposes that the content of the notebook was inserted not in 1118 but rather while developing the Vladimir chronicle. Looking at the broader

12 Voronin argues that the closing prayer after the letter expresses a mood of deep pessimism, which would have dominated the last days of Andrei Bogoliubskii rather than the last days of the optimistic Monomakh. He points out that most of the prayer is addressed to the Virgin who was viewed as the guardian of Vladimir, which was in grave danger in the last years of Andrei Bogoliubskii’s reign. Moreover, Voronin notes that the inclusion of excerpts from the canon of Andrew of Crete seems appropriate for one called by the same name - Andrei (‘O vremeni’, pp.268-71). A note of caution is always needed when judging prayers on the basis of tone.
sweep of the *Povest' vremennykh let*, Likhachev suggests that the editor anticipated the summit at Liubech in 1097, laying a foundation for Monomakh’s moral vision in his *Pouchenie*. Although the prominence of Monomakh and his vision interconnects the events, the *Pouchenie*’s unique occurrence in the Laurentian redaction and its different aim and form as an instructive piece of writing, set it apart from the other narratives of the chronicle.

Returning to the question of the *Pouchenie*’s composition, Ivakin suggests that the work was extensively re-edited. Only by repositioning key sentences and omitting passages, does he envisage that the work may have followed a more conventional ordering. Although Ivakin recognizes that these editorial ‘additions’ were probably written by Monomakh, he supposes that the separate fragments were put together randomly without any binding idea. Fennell, on the other hand, acknowledges certain features of the *Pouchenie* which give it shape - namely Monomakh’s addresses to his children and his audience, and the mood running through the excerpts from the Psalter of finding help in the Lord - but concludes that the quotations which follow are unconnected and form more of a miscellany.

On the contrary, I would suggest that Monomakh’s *Pouchenie* displays a clear sense of order in which prayer, especially the extracts from the Psalter, plays a significant role.

---

Repentance dominates most prayers and would not necessarily have been considered a negative feature.

Cherepnin argues that the *Pouchenie* was connected with the discourse related by Giuriata Rogovich about the Northern peoples and organically linked to the story of the blinding of Vasil’ko. See I.V. Cherepnin, ‘*Povest’ vremennykh let*’, *Istoricheskie zapiski*, 25, 1948, pp.318-21.

I.M. Ivakin, *Kniaz’ Vladimir Monomakh*, Moscow, 1901, (hereafter Ivakin, *Kniaz’ Vladimir*), pp.77-9, suggests that ‘АЦЕ АМ НИЙ ВЕ АНЯ ГРАМТИЦА ОП’ belongs to the end of the introduction, while the phrase beginning ‘ПРЯ ЕВА ДЕЛА И ДАМУ СЕНОВ’ opens the *Pouchenie*. In the narration of the messengers’ arrival, he notes the extra conjunction in ‘КРЕСТИЯ ЕО МА ОСИ’ and posits that this could have served as an illustration for the second point, ‘*етерн*’, which could be expected to follow the first, ‘*пифен*’. However, Monomakh uses a similar device later in his work to reiterate the importance of an action, rather than the first of a list: ‘*пифен к иерун*’.

Fennell, *Early Russian Literature*, p.67
Monomakh’s introductory statement underlines his Christian heritage, drawing attention to the fact that even his blessed and glorious grandfather, Iaroslav, took part in his christening. Judging by the chronicler’s depiction of Iaroslav the Wise, later generations saw his reign bathed in a rosy glow of princely unity. Following on from the lacuna of four and a half lines, Monomakh underlines his belonging to the princely line, attributing his preservation from calamity to God’s mercy and his father’s (or fathers’) prayer (πο ὑμιν ΜΟΝΑΤΡΒ). Likhachev interprets this as a reference to half-heathen ancestral prayer, inferring that Monomakh gave more credence to popular religion in Rus’ than is acknowledged by critics who depict him as an acolyte of the Greek Church.¹⁶ Birkfellner replies to Likhachev’s comments in an article, where he examines the various instances of the occurrence of the adjective ‘οτάνκ’ in the Povest’ vremennykh let. He concludes that in most cases it is applied to the prince of Kiev, who is senior but not necessarily the literal father.¹⁷ Nevertheless, this does not obviate Likhachev’s point that Monomakh valued the prayers of his uncanonized father or forefathers. It is worth bearing in mind, that the writers of the Skazanie and of the Povest’ vremennykh let also insert prayers made to princely ancestors, not least by Gleb, as noted earlier.¹⁸ In the Pouchenie reference to ancestral prayer emphasizes Monomakh’s consciousness of his descent from a Christian dynasty, undoubtedly a reminder to his children (including his nephews) that their extraction from a Christian ruling family should affect his behaviour and theirs. In this way ancestral prayer is enlisted to help unify the ruling princes in the Christian faith.

Having established his belonging to the ruling Christian clan, Monomakh starts in media res with his moral dilemma and finishes his first

¹⁷ G. Birkfellner, ‘Ot’nia molitva’, Slavistische Forschungen, 60, 1990, pp.127-37. By the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Birkfellner observes, the principle of seniority was defunct and such a reference would no longer be understood in the same way.
¹⁸ See p.101.
section with a eulogy to the creator. Generally ecclesiastical works begin with the creation, after which the individual finds his place. Such a scenario, however, could be seen to touch the nerve of politicking among the princes of the late eleventh and twelfth century. With the Prince of Kiev at the helm, the princes were supposed to act in unison to defend the right of each to their patrimonies. In this instance the princes were acting jointly as aggressors, and Monomakh is isolated by his decision to abide by his oath. The status of this event is significant in providing a role-model for future rulers, and as such Monomakh only sketches in details, without narrating the outcome. Of pivotal importance to the incident, and to the Pouchenie as a whole, is Monomakh’s meditation from the Psalter which can be seen to explain his actions.

Monomakh’s meditation is taken exclusively from the Psalter and is not interspersed with quotations from other sources. A careful scrutiny of this section reveals a clear line of argument. In my view, two false interpretative trails have been laid. First, the passage has been elucidated in terms of psalmomancy. Two variants have been put forward. One is to interpret Monomakh's comment, 'αλλη εις ποσαλθαλαν ἐν λεγε, ἀ περδαλαν πριηματιτε', as his response to his consultation of the Psalter as a divinatory book. Although Speranskii doubts that Monomakh used one of the divinatory psalters with notes attached to the text, he proposes an alternative method. According to this formula, the diviner chooses the first letters of an opened page of a Psalter or Gospel and then divides the letters into good and evil, or even and uneven letters to obtain his message. This, he suggests, is how Monomakh may have assembled his ‘favourite words’ and arrived at the answer, 'αλλη εις ποσαλθαλαν ἐν λεγε, ἀ περδαλαν πριηματιτε'. However, he admits that this result does not tally with answers found in divinatory Psalters from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries, nor with the

---

19 A. Orlov, Vladimir Monomakh, Moscow, 1946, pp.121-2, cites M. Speranskii, Iz istorii otrechennykh knig I, (Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva 129), St Petersburg, 1899, pp.5-6 & pp.59-61
method which relies on initial letters. This remark makes better sense if it is understood as Monmakh’s comment about the structure of his work as will be discussed below.

Ivakin arrives at the idea of divination from a different angle. He draws attention to the verb Monomakh employs when he writes that a particular passage from the Psalter struck him, ‘т вы ну тива’. Ivakin relates this to Sreznevskii’s observation that this same verb is used for the casting of lots. He cites a second example of this verb in the context of divination, when Prince Vladimir Vasil’kovich is described as opening one of the books of the prophets at random, and is struck by an extract which he uses to locate the site of his new town. Ivakin suggests that when the verb ‘vynut’sia’ is used in relation to a book, as in the two previous examples, it must be understood figuratively. The diviner, he adds, still has the task of applying the extract to his situation. The theory of psalmomancy, however, overlooks one crucial fact. Monomakh does not open the Psalter to seek guidance. He has already responded to the messengers news in a decisive way without seeking additional confirmation. In this instance, it may be more accurate to speak of retrospective divination since Monomakh subsequently opens the Psalter seemingly at random, and is struck by a particular verse from which follows his meditation.

A second way of looking at these extracts has been to emphasize the fact that they are taken from the readings for the pre-Lenten and Lenten season, a theory advanced by Shliakov. He argues that Monomakh wrote the Pouchenie in 1106 under his recent impressions of the first week of Lent at a hunting lodge near Rostov. Istrin agrees in a more general vein that Monomakh’s choice might have been motivated by his affinity with the penitential character of psalms of this season. This argument, however, is

20 Ivakin, Kniaz' Vladimir, pp.89-90.
21 Ivakin, Kniaz' Vladimir, p.84
22 Shliakov, 'O Pouchenii', 6, May & June, pp.209-58
seriously weakened by the discovery that the final prayer after Monomakh’s letter, containing a significant number of quotations from the Lenten liturgy, is no longer attributed to him. In addition, to focus solely on the penitential setting of the psalms in the Lenten liturgy, overlooks the content of the Psalter excerpts. They offer the reader neither a general exhortation to find their strength in God, nor an example of psalmomancy, rather they evoke a picture of the righteous man who inherits the land and enjoys ultimate victory over the wicked. Monomakh affirms that his children live in a moral universe where, ‘есть бого судить земли’. Thus the selection of excerpts acts as a commentary on the events Monomakh describes, explaining to posterity the philosophical basis of his life in the words of an authoritative text.

Most of the first half of Monomakh’s selection from the Psalter is taken from psalm thirty-six, which encapsulates the contrast between the wicked and the righteous man. The first verse exhorts the reader not to be jealous of those who do evil, nor to envy those who break the law, ‘не ревнуй ауканующимь, ни замани творящимь беззаконье’. This advice is of particular relevance for princes tempted to break their oath in order to benefit themselves. Rather than proceed to the next verse which elaborates on the transience of the wicked - ‘зане ве тьера ведро ишашь’ - Monomakh skips several verses and picks up the text again to pronounce the verdict on the wicked found in verse nine. A smooth transition is made between verses one and nine since, verse nine also continues with the same conjunction as verse two ‘зане’, and repeats the word used earlier for evildoers - ‘зане ауканующим погреатся’. By contrast, it is the meek and those who wait patiently for the Lord who are seen to possess the land. Monomakh reiterates this idea for a third time in the words of the psalm. These verses

---

24 PVLL, col. 241
comment directly on the question of inheritance and land, a topical issue among the princes of Rus'.

As an old man, Monomakh would have identified easily with the the psalmist’s cry which he cites, ‘ψυλονι σια το εζλα, ει κατομαι δος και λεγει τον θεον θεωθαναι και ημεν εν εκκ ημαμεν’.25 If indeed Monomakh was writing the Pouchenie in his old age, then his current position as prince of Kiev vindicated his decision taken earlier not to grasp at the seat of Kiev but, according to the chronicler, instead to wait patiently until popular demand conferred on him this role.

The course of the righteous man is seen to involve struggle, and Monomakh emphasizes the need to turn from evil, do good and actively pursue peace. In order to include this third crucial imperative, Monomakh combines the relevant verse from psalm thirty-six, ‘ψυλονι σια το εζλα, ει κατομαι δος και λεγει τον θεον θεωθαναι και ημεν εν εκκ ημαμεν’,26 with a similar sentiment from another psalm, ‘ψυλονι σια το εζλα και κατομαι δος και λεγει τον θεον θεωθαναι και ημεν εν εκκ ημαμεν’27 to form an amalgam - ‘ψυλονικα σια το εζλα, κατομαι δος και λεγει τον θεον θεωθαναι και ημεν εν εκκ ημαμεν’.

As an editor, Monomakh’s abbreviation of extracts shows a tendency to reduce the text to the essentials of an argument rather than to elaborate it. For example, the fuller rendering, ‘οτο γοπερε στοπις χελωεικες εκφαβειες σια, ει κατομαι εικονις εκελεικες; ηεδα σια παδει, ει πορτιτις σια, ει κο γοπερε ποδαμειες και ραγκ γες’,28 is abbreviated to convey the key point, ‘στοπις χελωεικες εκφαβειες. ηεδα σια παδει, και ει πορτιτις σια, ει κο γοπερε ποδαμειες πουκυ νεγο’.

While stressing the natural and persistent hostility of the wicked to the righteous man Monomakh at times omits phrases from the original which indicate God’s rescue or the psalmist’s faith so that the picture of opposition remains uppermost. As a result the sentences do not always read

---

25 *PVLL* col.241 (Ps. 36:25)
26 Sever’ianov, S. (ed.), *Sinaiskia Psaltyr’*, Petrograd, 1922; repr. Graz, 1954, (hereafter *Psalterium Sinaiticum*), 48a, Ps. 36.27
27 *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, 41a, Ps. 33:15
28 *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, 47b, Ps. 36:23, 24
fluently. Quoting from psalm one hundred and twenty-three, ‘всегда стать человекомъ, чьё житие пожорилъ ихъ ниса, всегда прогневатись варости нега на ны, своя вода къ ны потонила’; Monomakh omits the preceding clause, ‘воке мьите не Господа би бьвь въ насЪ’; without which the sentence does not flow smoothly. In two further examples, Monomakh’s editing also appears deliberately to intensify the relentless opposition which the righteous man endures. Citing the psalmist’s words, ‘знамену я, Боже, якo попрала я человецъ весь день вратась, стужи ми. Попрала я враты мои, иако многие буришика со мною скрывы’, Monomakh breaks off before the psalmist expresses his faith in God in the face of his persecutors, a cry that is heard in the next verse, ‘вся день не рвогон ся, азъ же рвогоня на тва’. In a second example, Monomakh quotes, ‘извыя яа вт врагъ моихъ, Боже, и вт всташнихъ на яа встами яа. Иззыя яа вт творашнихъ беззаконь, и вт мугя криви саки яа, яко се вулавшя дарея мое’, but halts before the emphasis shifts to innocent suffering, ‘нападъ на яа криви, ни беззакониа же мое, ни грехъ мои Господ’.

Joy and praise are brought to the fore as Monomakh reaches the end of his selection. Here the excerpts relate specifically to the victory and the joy of the righteous. In the present the righteous may endure unremitting opposition and suffer apparent defeat, but Monomakh sees their ultimate victory in vivid terms, ‘возвеселитя праведники и егда видить мсть, руце свои умуве в кровь грешника’. Instead of dwelling on innocent suffering, Monomakh chooses to illustrate hope in a future when mourning will be turned to joy, ‘вечеръ вдоворитса плачь, и завтра радость’.

29 PVLL, col.242 (Ps. 123:2,3)
30 Psalterium Sinaicum, 169b (Ps. 123:2)
31 PVLL, col.242 (Ps. 55:2,3)
32 Psalterium Sinaicum, 69a, Ps. 55:4
33 PVLL, col.242 (Ps. 58:2,3,4)
34 Psalterium Sinaicum, 72a, Ps. 58:4
35 PVLL, col.242 (Ps. 57:11)
36 PVLL, col.242 (Ps. 29:5)
words of a familiar psalm of praise, Monomakh inserts another promise of joy specifically for the righteous, ‘Блаженны вси праведнии сердцы’.

Despite the Lenten season of these psalms Monomakh avoids cries of repentance as his major theme. At the outset of the ‘divine words’ it appears that his aim is to present the principle which guided his decision not to join the conspirators and thereby promote the same principle for his children’s behaviour. As far as a prince of the late eleventh and early twelfth-century Rus’ was concerned, the issue of personal piety had repercussions for the whole of Rus’.

If the episode which sparks off Monomakh’s meditation on the Psalter offers such a cohesive and well-ordered reading of extracts, this suggests that the whole work is ordered more carefully than has been assumed. In the past attempts have been made to demonstrate that the Pouchenie is structured after the fashion of a father’s counsel to his children. Certainly medieval readers were familiar with this genre, evident in the wisdom literature of the Old Testament, in particular the address of a father to his son in the book of Proverbs. Analogous works can be found in Byzantine literature, among medieval German and French and Anglo-Saxon writers, as well as those translated into Church Slavonic. Alekseev compares Monomakh’s Pouchenie with the Anglo-Saxon work Fäder

37 PVLL, col.242 (Ps. 31:11)
38 Evidence that Monomakh wrote his work during the Lenten period is crucial to Shliakov’s thesis (Shliakov, ‘O Pouchenii’, 6, May & June, pp.213-5). One strand of his argument, namely the Lenten character of the prayer placed after the letter, has already been challenged (see n.2). The second plank of his argument is based on an examination of Monomakh’s choice of psalms in his opening meditation. He observes that, apart from three verses in psalms 33 and 62, Monomakh does not draw on the psalms used in the fixed services. This, he comments, shows that the prince selects his material according to content and not just on the basis of familiarity. Shliakov does not expand this point but concentrates on the fact that excerpts from the majority of psalms, 55, 57, 58, 62 and 63, belong to the eighth kathismos, which was read periodically throughout Lent. I would add, however, that the longest quotation of twenty-seven verses is taken from psalm 36 which forms a part of the fifth kathismos. For liturgical use the Psalter is divided up into twenty kathismoi which are read throughout the year, and intensively during Lent. While it is striking that the excerpts taken from the eighth kathismos follow the expected order (only one verse from psalm 29 interrupts the sequence), nevertheless, Monomakh’s reading of the Psalter cannot be limited to the Lenten period. Content appears to remain the over-riding factor determining Monomakh’s selection.
Larcwidas. The form, however, only approximates its Anglo-Saxon counterpart if sections such as the excerpts from the Psalter and from Basil the Great’s works and the so-called autobiography, are viewed as additions. In this case a similar order and content of teachings emerges.\(^{39}\)

In the search for precedents, two works in the Izbomik 1076, ‘

In this instance however, contrast rather than comparison is instructive. The father of ‘

He is confident that if his son listens to his words they will prove sweeter than honey and enliven him for eternity. This introduction contrasts with Monomakh’s approach, who begins with real events and is modest about his own words of advice, distinguishing them from the divine words. Whereas the father urges his son to imitate those who have lived in seclusion from this life, Monomakh tells his children how to live in the world. Though Monomakh is aware of man’s mortality, he expresses joy in creation. This contrasts with the father who admonishes his son not to take joy in the things of this world, but to dwell constantly on death.\(^{41}\) Xenophon’s words to his sons take yet another form. Firstly, Xenophon presents his own life as

\(^{39}\) M.P. Alekseev, ‘Anglo-saksonskaia parallel’ k “Poucheniiu” Vladimira Monomakha’, TOL, 2, 1935, pp.39-80, lists these, roughly speaking, as: how to relate to God, your attitude towards others, the need to love your teachers (in Monomakh’s case the clergy), how to avoid immorality, to be zealous in doing good, and having equal regard for all men. Although he concludes that we can only speak of analogy rather than of direct borrowings, he suggests a route by which at least the gist of Fader Larcwidas could have been described to Monomakh by his wife Gytha. She was the daughter of Harold and at the beginning of 1068 the family were in the besieged town of Exeter, within reach of the well-stocked library containing a copy of Fader Larcwidas. Critics date the so-called Exeter Book to the late tenth, early eleventh century. Against this background, Alekseev posits that Monomakh’s Pouchenie could have been conceived as an educational aid, intended also for moral instruction. In particular, he draws attention to Monomakh’s commendation of language learning, appropriate to a pedagogical context. There is, however, no compelling reason to make the parallel between Monomakh’s Pouchenie and the Anglo-Saxon work Fader Larcwidas more than a general one.

\(^{40}\) V.G. Dem’ianov et al. (eds), Izbornik 1076 goda, Moscow, 1965, (hereafter Izbornik 1076).

\(^{41}\) He commends those who ‘малая съєта съ еи привлечаныя’ (Izbornik 1076, p.162). He warns his son ‘не елшьшни ечоме (т)ка’ (Izbornik 1076, p.168). He also urges him ‘само геть поминам ечоне’ for this reminder will teach him best how to live in this short time (p.174).
an example, listing the good things he has done and the vices he avoided. Secondly, he turns to his sons with a string of imperatives intended to guide their behaviour. In essence the works in *Izbornik 1076* are from ‘fictional’ characters and addressed to Everyman. Monomakh, on the other hand, writes as a layman and prince to his children, and secondarily to anyone who may happen to read his instruction. This suggests that Monomakh was more concerned to address the issues of his day, than to follow a literary precedent. Function rather than form would be expected to dictate any ordering.

Monomakh orders his work under three main sections: extracts from the divine writings, his own words of advice, and lastly the list of his expeditions and hunts. Collectively he describes them as a ‘словаца’ or ‘грамотица’. The use of the two diminutives indicates that Monomakh does not intend writing a voluminous work, but chooses to focus on the essentials. His way of highlighting his underlying principles is seen in the remark at the end of his words of advice, ‘це же вы конец всякому, страх Божий имите выше всего. Аще забынете всего, а часто прочитайте, и мне будетъ бо-орома, и вамъ будетъ добръ’. Even if his reader was to forget everything else that he read, Monomakh urges him to remember one thing, the fear of God.

Returning to Monomakh’s own comments on the order and structuring of his work, he writes ‘и потому собрах словаца си имеах, и складах по раду, и написах. Аще вы последнах не имеах, а переднах принимайте’. Ivakin’s interpretation of these remarks depends on his theory of divination and in the light of the previous discussion can be dismissed. Likhachev offers the most satisfactory explanation. Under ‘former’, he understands the ‘divine writings’ which make up the first part, and under ‘latter’,
Monomakh’s own words of advice which comes from his ‘poor mind’. Thus, if the reader rejects Monomakh’s own words of advice, he is urged to accept the half which consists of the divine writings. I would add that if Monomakh already refers to the next part of his work, this suggests that his claim to have ordered his words (καλακαθαρα τον θεσμόν) applies not just to the extracts from the Psalter but also to the whole of the Pouchenie. Likhachev, however, does not apply Monomakh’s remark to the whole of the Pouchenie and like Istrin, he wonders whether the segmented structure simply reflects the order in which he copied the excerpts from various books. Admittedly, the various fragments do not always follow seamlessly one from another. As well as the surprising position of ‘θυ’ in the narrative of the messengers’ arrival ‘ανδρεία θυ Μα καλεί ωτ ρατα μουα’, Ivakin notes the inclusion of ‘τυ’ in ‘ανακε θυ εις παλαμος πυζίσε, σερακε τυ θνουα’, which suggests that the text was extracted from a narrative piece. Judging by Monomakh’s editing of the quotations from the Psalter, more weight is given to relevant passages which fit his overall argument, than to smooth stylistic transitions. For while Monomakh does not consistently rework each fragment so that the whole merges into a single harmonious reading, an order can be discerned. Underlying his whole work is the question of how a prince should live according to a Christian model within the family complex of political and perceived spiritual ties, which existed in the early twelfth century. I will consider how the brief prayers act as a unifying thread in the Pouchenie, reinforcing the message of humility and brotherly love, before

---

45 Povest’, II, p.435. Monomakh also separates the divine writings from his own instruction later when he comments, ‘ον σοιεια προφασαρι οδιεν σκαν, ευηκτειναε, πυζιεμε θυ ναν, ανεσαμα να νοησε ευε θυ ανακε θυ ρατα μουα, και να χε θγαντε μηνε επαναλαμ νακαμιε. Πυζουβακε αμεν, αε θυ εκα παλμεν, το παλινιν’ (PVLL, col.245).
47 PVLL, col.242
48 L. Müller, ‘Noch einmal zu Vladimir Monomachs Zitat aus einer asketischen Rede Basilius des Großen’, Russia Mediaevalis, 4, 1979, pp.16-24, argues that the first extract ascribed to St Basil in Monomakh’s Pouchenie is closer to the Life of St. Basil than Basil’s teaching on good deeds which had been cited previously as the probable source.
considering Monomakh’s advice about the manner and the times when his children should pray.

How a prince should behave towards others is a major theme reflected in the order of the ‘divine words’. Having copied out relevant excerpts from the Psalter, Monomakh continues with extracts from works by, or associated with, Basil the Great. These extracts recommend how young men should behave with various groups of people. Advice is given on how to meet people in an appropriate way, on the need to discipline one’s body, and on how to respond to insult. Monomakh intersperses these extracts with short prayers which orientate the reader in relation to God. At first glance the prayer slipped between citations from Basil’s work appears to contain a personal plea for humility, ‘в Владычице Богородице, втими вт никого сердца моего гордость и бесты, да не взыносясь судно мира сего в пустыньём сьм житьи’. Its position, however, also connects it to the injunction given to act humbly and to look for eternal reward rather than for instant gratification. This theme can be traced to Basil’s exhortation to keep one’s eyes lowered and one’s soul aloft (днл учи имьти, а дншу горь), and to hope in God’s commendation (вт Бога мзды да чашь и вчных блага наладится).

In the Pouchenie, this theme is highlighted by Basil’s admonitions to refrain from revenge if injured, to be patient if hated or persecuted, to pray if insulted, and to put to death sin in oneself. In addition, Monomakh quotes a passage from Isaiah where the prophet calls for justice and then invites the people to repent and be cleansed from their sin. Having reiterated his concern for his children to live at peace with one another, to maintain justice and repent, Monomakh cites a fragment of the Lenten liturgy,

| PVLL, col.243 |
| PVLL, col.243 |
Shliakov explains the reference to blood in the context of Lent, as abstinence from meat. Another way of interpreting this reference is in the light of Monomakh’s emphasis on repentance and a right relationship with God as the key to harmonious relationships between the princes. The call for brothers to cleanse themselves ‘чистимъ собе, братья’, applies to the brothers of the princely families, as well as the community of Christian brothers. Monomakh’s next point, which he addresses specifically to his children, contrasts the haste with which man retaliates in bloodshed to the long-suffering nature of God’s mercy, ‘мы человцы, грешни суще и смертни, то желы вы зло створи и то хощем в пожрети и кровь его проляти вскоре’. When Monomakh cautions his children against an oath sworn in haste, he refers to ‘братья’ as the first group to whom one would swear an oath and then to others. Bloodshed among the princes was a double crime, since it injured their brother and violated the cross on which their oath was sworn. In his letter to Oleg, Monomakh explains that he is hardly able to understand why Oleg did not take the initiative in sending him a conciliatory and sorrowful letter. He imagines how Oleg should have reacted on seeing the spilled blood of his nephew, ‘замъ тежъ, узрьешь кровь его и тело вклюнуешь, како цвятъ нову приютишь, како днинца дмолну’. Recollecting his recent hostilities with Oleg and his Polovtsian allies at Starodub, Monomakh protests that he wanted no part in fratricide. In this context behaviour is seen to be a matter of life or death. Repentance and prayer is one way which Monomakh urged on his readers to break the vicious circle of injury and revenge.

---
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While Monomakh’s second section is full of practical examples of how a prince of Rus’ should behave, he still begins with advice on prayer. Repentance is placed before other injunctions and is seen to provide a foundation for what follows. As in the ‘divine writings’, Monomakh begins with the experience which leads him to prayer and meditation. If God softens your heart and you shed tears over your sins, Monomakh recommends the prayer, ‘такоже блуднице и разговорика и мятча помилываешь се, тако и нас грехиних помилуй’.\(^{57}\) When giving advice about how to treat certain groups in society, Monomakh again inserts a brief prayer. Enjoining his children to show love, in this instance to the clergy, Monomakh cites a prayer, ‘не ризы, смертны коны, аны живы, а злутра в гроб, се вси честны ко вкак, не наше не тво, поручил ны се на малъ дани. И в земли не хороните, то ньсть велики грехъ’.\(^{58}\) Only the change of verb to the second person singular signals that this prayer is addressed to God and is not merely a general comment on the mortality of mankind. Once again, the key to harmonious relationships is shown to be an attitude of humility before God expressed through prayer.

Monomakh is realistic about spirituality in a secular environment.\(^{59}\) He does not advocate a stringent ascetic model as the only sure path to salvation, ‘ни单身чество, ни чернечество, ни голода, како инни добрии терпать.’\(^{60}\) Three crucial deeds he identifies are repentance, tears and almsgiving.\(^{61}\)

---

\(^{57}\) *PVLL*, col.245. In the chronicler’s eulogy to Monomakh he notes that he had the gift of tears, ‘и даров онъ дья Господа, да нежды в престол виноваша и слеза пенья, и дылъ се заеты испудеша. И такъ милены къ владыцы Христу и селямы воплудаша, твъя и Бытъ ея приказал ибъ сршаша’ (cols.294-5).

\(^{58}\) *PVLL*, cols. 245-6

\(^{59}\) Monomakh’s frequent use of the conditional ‘if’ often signals an allowance for circumstances. If you are not able, Monomakh recommends three genuflections, if his children and readers do not know other prayers, he suggests one, and only if you are able to keep your oath does Monomakh advise kissing the cross.

\(^{60}\) *PVLL*, col.244

\(^{61}\) ‘Покаяныя, се зады и милосты’ (*PVLL*, col.244). In fact the two main requirements are repentance and almsgiving. Tears are considered a gift from God. Monomakh was evidently a man moved to tears on a number of occasions. When he heard Vasil’ko had been blinded he wept ‘ubitакая’ (*PVLL*, col.262). In Monomakh’s own words of advice tears are a result of God’s work, ‘да еже Господь показаш отрады и с воды очи испустите...’
Through these three deeds he is confident that the reader will conquer the enemy and inherit God’s kingdom. Monomakh is convinced that these deeds are not too arduous and reassures his children several times, ‘не так жёлка занятье Божьим’. Although Monomakh does not advocate a monastic lifestyle, he does give guidelines on how and when to pray. He commends his own father as an example of diligence in his study of languages at home, and particularly for his habit of rising before dawn for matins. He urges his reader not to neglect going to church, and to genuflect at least three times before going to bed. Monomakh sets store by the power of nocturnal genuflection and chanting in order to defeat the devil and flee from wrong committed during the day. When at home, Monomakh recommends a midday sleep. This was a custom observed in the Kievan Caves Monastery, which Feodosii explains to prince Iziaslav as a necessary part of the routine so that the brothers can pray and chant at night. Monomakh bases his reasoning on creation and the natural order which God ordains. While laying down general guidelines, Monomakh does not specify times, unlike Xenophon who stipulates in his instruction the times that his sons should pray, ‘о чаде, любя ги предважи, молитвы егасли къ Богъ трияти часъ и И и въ вечерня и лукуторию жела къ егасли’. Monomakh is also concerned that his children should grasp the need for constant prayer. He advises them

---

62 Monomakh underlines this last point, ‘та ео отецъ мнъ даваант слажный и къ души мужи сча resume’ (PVII, col.246).
63 In the November Menaion one of John Chrysostom’s sermons is dedicated to this theme. It is entitled, ‘Словъ е намъ кажетъ какъ глаголатъ и въ весть еямы на молитву еженыя христианину’. He entreats women, men and children not to neglect this practice for ‘тъ тъ и тъ мнъ и тъ чужъ привадетъ тны на пикилъ’. See Metropolitan Makarii (ed.), Velikia Minei Chetii, St Petersburg, 1897, November 1-12, col.1236.
64 Feodosii explains that the gatekeeper is under orders to allow no one through the gate at this time ‘входя да ео годъ паганльныя не исходять ератья изъ монастыря изъ причинятъ ео въ кремъ ежныяго ряда славослова’ (Usp misc, p.94).
65 ‘Словы есть въ Богъ присяга паганльны, въ чымъ ео привадетъ и дуръ и гици и чалыци’ (PVII, col.247).
66 Izbornik 1076, pp.482-3. In ‘слова бытия ода къ словы саемый’ the father points to the Church as a place of respite in times of trouble, but urges his children always to be diligent in going to church, ‘изъ есъ часы и дами ейшадъ, припади къ вышенему лицъ мнъ (оу) души пек(ви)’ (p.172).
that while on horseback, if they are not talking to someone, they should pray.

Monomakh does not try to broaden his children’s knowledge of prayers but distills familiar images and prayers of confession. If they do not know other prayers by heart, Monomakh quotes, ‘Господи помилуй’ as one memorable for all. His instruction to recite the prayer ‘Бес престани естеств’, followed by the comment, ‘Та бо есть молитва всеблагая’ might seem to lend the prayer an aura of mysticism akin to that associated with the recitation of the Jesus prayer. Monomakh adds, however, that it is better to pray thus than think nonsense.

While emphasizing the need to confess and repent, Monomakh celebrates life and creation. After matins, on seeing the rising sun Monomakh quotes two prayers of joy, “прекзыти ми молите Христе Боже, иже дале ми ски светъ твояи красивъ”. И еще, “Господи, приложи ми лето къ лету, да прокуте греховъ сображека, исправимъ жизнь”, тако покаялъ Богъ. His first prayer is like a concentrate of prayers typifying the morning liturgy, where a recurrent theme is thanksgiving for the light of a new day after the darkness and sleep of night, understood as a metaphor for spiritual insensibility and evil. In Monomakh’s prayer, light is valued as a natural element as well as a symbol of spiritual illumination. Rather than glimpse the shadow of the departing night in the sunshine, Monomakh looks forward in his second prayer to longevity and a righteous life.

In his wonder at the miracles of creation, God is seen as worthy of praise and most of the final section of the ‘divine words’ is addressed to him. Creation is viewed not as the vanity of this world but as a gift given
for mankind's enjoyment and sustenance. After Monomakh has expressed his amazement at God's divine ordering of the birds' movement and song, he exclaims, 'A благословень нси, Господи, и хваленъ зело, вся чудеса и ты доброты створилъ и дадалъ, да иже не хвалить тебе Господи, и не втврить всём сердцемъ и всём душамъ во имя Устъ и Сына и Святаго Духа, да будьте проклали'.

Whereas Monomakh is modest about his own work, he is uncompromising as far as the 'divine words' are concerned. Praise to God marks the beginning of the _Pouchenie_, very likely the theme of the missing four and a half lines, the end of his 'divine words' and also the end of the third section recounting his expeditions. For the benefit of whoever reads his work he assures them, 'не хвало бо са, ни достости своя, не хвало Бого и проклаляю милость его, иже я́ грешного и худаго сего а́ во сбава во трех часъ смертныхъ.'

The resumé of Monomakh's expeditions and hunts has appeared so distinct from the rest of the _Pouchenie_ that it has been given a separate label. Istrin supposes that Monomakh assembled his work at the end of his life, incorporating his diary of events as the third section. I would argue that the third part of the _Pouchenie_ is also integral to the prince's portrayal of his spirituality, where principles from physical life are seen to pertain to spiritual life. In the account of Monomakh's expeditions and hunts, repeated reference is made to his 'трудал'. He begins this section by writing that he will relate 'трудал свои, иже са есмь трудал'. Throughout the _Pouchenie_, Monomakh impresses on his children that they must not be lazy. This is familiar with expanses of land than sea. Monomakh, however, does not favour an oblique method and, while God's control over the birds reflects his ordering of the universe, the main thrust of this section is stated at the beginning, 'вамъ кон Господи и чина дзела твоя.'

70 _PVLL_, col.244-5
71 _PVLL_, col.251-2
72 Judging by the discrepancy between Monomakh's allusion to eighty-three major expeditions and the seventy described in the text, he speculates that a folio may be missing (Istrin, _Ocherk_, pp.163-8).
73 The word 'трудал' is used frequently to describe the labour of monks in vigils, fasting and prayer. Monomakh's perception of 'labour' encompasses all his activities, external and internal.
74 _PVLL_, col.247
seen to apply at war, at home and at prayer. Laziness and forgetfulness are viewed as dangerous accomplices. Exhorting his children to observe the three good deeds, Monomakh implores them, ‘α Εξα δεδα η λενιτες, κολακες, α σε, η λαμβανετε’. At the end of Monomakh's account he emphasizes that he did not rely on others to work for him but gave himself no rest at war, while hunting or at home. Alongside these activities Monomakh places his diligence in protecting the vulnerable in society and in observing the practices of the church.\textsuperscript{75} In his attempt to establish a principle of work and assiduity in all spheres of life, the account of Monomakh’s frays and hunts becomes relevant to Christian living.

Although much of the early writing on Rus' focusses on the lives of its saints and princes, few literary works are written by them, or indeed by lay people at all. The \textit{Pouchenie} provides a unique insight into Christian spirituality outside the monastery. Although Monomakh endorses regular church attendance, particularly matins, in addition to nocturnal genuflection and inner mental prayer, it is not the ritual in itself which appears to motivate his writing. One of the marks of Monomakh’s spirituality is its grounding in reality. Seemingly unrelated parts of life, such as the need for diligence and the results won through hard work, display principles which he also applies to his spiritual life. The practical dilemma of whether to break his oath or not, provides the impetus for his meditation from the Psalter. The choice of excerpts from the Psalter, when considered in the context of the different psalms quoted, is seen to be dictated by a concern to show that the righteous will be vindicated at the end.

Monomakh makes no claim to write according to any literary canon, a course of action more readily employed by a professional bookman, and therefore it is hardly surprising that the \textit{Pouchenie} does not conform exactly to any one model. Neither should one expect the extracts to follow one

\textsuperscript{75} 'И церковника тараба и ошутим са́м себе́ призва́л' (\textit{PVLII}, col.251). Monomakh stresses his personal effort by using the perfective forms of verbs in his concluding remarks, for example 'сам са́м дело... не даде воле... сам са́м призва́л'.
another seamlessly. Rather than following a literary form, Monomakh appears to order his work so that it expresses his over-riding preoccupation - a moral code of behaviour for the princes of Rus'. A study of the extracts from the Psalter sets a precedent for such an assumption. Prayers, particularly the extracts from the Psalter, are a key aspect of this morality, illustrating the rewards of being righteous even when faced with the allurements of power and wealth secured by means of bloodshed and treachery. In addition, prayers are seen to offer the secret by which man transforms his inner attitude and so behaves with humility toward his fellow men. Thereby Monomakh advances a pattern which could revolutionize the constant warring between princes over territories if taken beyond the literary text and put into practice. Judged on this basis, the Pouchenie is not a random selection of Monomakh's favourite quotations copied out of his notebook, but a work ordered to promote a way of conciliation. Thus Monomakh's work is seen to reflect a spirituality that combines both joy and repentance, of particular relevance for his own generation, holding up an impressive model which, if taken seriously, could help to unite the nation of Rus'.
Kirill of Turov and a language for prayer

Of the prayers examined so far, all have some historical reference to the time of their composition. For example, Konstantin of Preslav’s *Alphabetical prayer* celebrates the recently created Slavonic script, while the prayer which follows Ilarion’s sermon perceives the land of Rus’ as a new Christian land and people. Prince Vladimir I’s prayers mark his own conversion and baptism as well as that of Rus’, while Boris and Gleb utter their prayers as the first native martyrs - all momentous events in shaping the emerging perceptions of nationhood and spirituality in Rus’. In addition, Feodosii’s role as intercessor strengthens the identity of the Kievan Caves Monastery - in many respects a flagship of spiritual life in Kiev, while Monomakh’s meditation offers a moral plumbline for the squabbling princes. By contrast, Kirill’s weekly prayer cycle, like his other writings, appears to be isolated from contemporary events. Whereas Feodosii’s life is well documented with frustratingly few recorded prayers, Kirill’s life is only sketchily outlined, with a wealth of prayers and sermons ascribed to him. This chapter, therefore, will only indirectly touch on the perception of nationhood in so far as it is indissolubly linked to the spirituality of Rus’. Once Christianity had made inroads in Rus’, establishing both the institutions and rituals of the Church, the challenge remained of how to encourage people to apprehend inner spiritual reality, as well as observe the external rite. Using examples from Kirill’s prayer cycle, I will show how his skill as a writer potentially makes the spiritual world immediate and vivid in the eyes of his reader. His prayers also give an indication of the material being read in Kievan Rus’, especially by the monks, and this in turn suggests how Christian spirituality may have been percieved at that
time. Since this study explores how prayers portray the spiritual world, more attention will be given to stylistic devices than in earlier chapters. This seems appropriate, given the importance of language used as a tool to express a relationship with God.

Kirill’s cycle of prayers is also exceptional in that its literary setting is voluminous - the prayer book. The prayers investigated so far by other writers find a context within a separate literary work, even if later they appear independently in prayer books. Kirill’s prayers, written according to the daily rote of matin, hour and vesper, follow the sacred themes observed in the liturgy during the course of a week. As well as conforming to the general liturgical pattern, each prayer also belongs to the specific context of Kirill’s cycle. In this respect Kirill’s prayer cycle forms a separate work, representing a more homogenous creation than a collection of individual prayers written for a particular day by a number of different authors. Given this, I shall regard the prayer cycle itself as the primary literary context, making passing reference to the *Laroslav miscellany* as the earliest surviving manuscript containing Kirill’s prayers for hours and vespers. By writing a weekly prayer cycle in this fashion, Kirill appears to have made unique contribution to the prayer book, as no precise model has been identified.¹

Until recently scholars tended to focus on Kirill’s sermons, noting in particular the skillful way he re-creates the Gospel stories for his listeners and organizes his material.² Kirill’s prayers are profoundly penitential and, somewhat misleadingly, have been described as artless and simple, an

¹ E.B. Rogachevskaiia, *Molitvoslovnoe tvorchestvo Kirilla Turovskogo (Problemy tekstologii i poetiki)*, Moscow, kandidat. thesis, 1993, (hereafter Rogachevskaiia, *Molitvoslovnoe tvorchestvo*), chapter two, draws a comparison with St Ephrem’s cycle of penitential Vesper prayers also written for specific days of the week. She observes that one cannot be certain whether Kirill knew Ephrem’s works or not.
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outpouring of thought and feeling. One obstacle to the study of Kirill’s prayers has been the lack of a scholarly edition, a gap shortly to be filled by Rogachevskaia, whose edition awaits publication.

The sixty or so manuscripts containing one or more of Kirill’s prayers indicate the level of their popularity, particularly in the sixteenth century. The earliest manuscript which includes Kirill’s hour and vespers prayers, the thirteenth-century Laroslav miscellany, appears to have been written for the monastic community. Rather than many of the regular prayers, the Laroslav miscellany contains less common prayers which could be said or chanted between the daily services by monks. Barsov has suggested that it bears greatest resemblance to the Greek prayer book used in the skete communities, which were sometimes left without a priest to officiate at services. Speranskii notes that the miscellany contains works of an unusual character, revealing Latin influence and also including material which was later banned, a feature which indicates its early origin. Rogachevskaia sees the hand of Kirill himself behind the overall ordering of the Laroslav miscellany. She proposes that Kirill formed his own weekly rule (ustav) for the monastery to which he belonged at the time. While additional instructions attached to Kirill’s vespers and hour prayers, suggest that he may have written a rule comprising his prayer cycle and these

---

4 Rogachevskaia has made a textual study of Kirill’s weekly cycle of prayers in preparation for the publication of her critical edition. She observes that only twenty-one of the prayers included in the cycle can be ascribed to him with any degree of certainty, three for each day, since the titles of additional Vesper prayers do not name Kirill as author (Rogachevskaia, Molitvoslovnoe tvorchestvo, ch.1, p.2). Therefore, the anonymous Vesper prayers sometimes attributed to Kirill will not be considered here as his work. Unless specified otherwise, quotations from Kirill’s prayers will be taken from Kirill von Turov. Gebete. Nach der Ausgabe in Pravoslavnyi sobesednik 1858, repr. ed. D. Tschizewskij, (Slavische Propyläen 6), Munich, 1965; hereafter Gebete.
5 E.V. Barsov, ‘Kharateinyi spisok XIVv molitv Kirilla Turovskogo’, Trudy sed’mogo arkeologicheskogo s’ezda v Laroslave 1887, ed. Count Uvarov, Moscow, 1887, p.49
6 M. Speranskii, ‘Laroslav’skii zbirnik XIIIv.’, Naukovii Zbirnik za rik 1924, 19, pp.29-36
7 Rogachevskaia divides the manuscripts of Kirill’s prayers into two redactions, the first redaction being distinguished primarily by the instructions which accompany the texts and would have been intended primarily for monks. She views Kirill as an innovator rather than an imitator of Byzantine monastic writing (see Rogachevskaia, Molitvoslovnoe tvorchestvo, ch.1).
instructions, so far there is no further evidence to indicate that the scope of such a rule included the whole of the Iaroslav miscellany.

As mentioned earlier, this chapter explores primarily how Kirill’s prayers bring to life Christian spirituality for the individual, rather than focussing on their setting within his weekly prayer cycle. Just as Kirill’s skill in bringing the Gospel stories to life has been noted as a feature of his sermons, so too an ability to involve his audience characterizes his prayers which per se demand a greater degree of participation. Here the reader is a key protagonist in the text. Communal prayer necessarily entails confession and statements of a more general character. By writing prayers for the individual, Kirill captures the intensity of a meeting with God. Whereas writers of other texts may have greater choice in the extent to which time is re-created as ‘present time’, the writer of prayers generally addresses the reader’s here and now. Immediacy is of the moment. As well as the relation between the reader and the text, the medieval distinction between ‘sacred’ and ‘historical’ time should be considered. Operating in sacred time, the history of salvation is ‘relived’ through the Church’s annual feasts, weekly cycle and hourly pattern. Time is perceived to operate on three different levels, so that the past before Christ points to him, the events of Christ’s life are considered a continuing reality in the present, with the present foreshadowing the life of the world to come. While lay people were generally aware of the Church’s calendar, the life of a monk was ordered more specifically according to sacred time.

Kirill retains the familiar pattern of linking sacred time with the reader’s present but intensifies the experience. To create an immediacy of

---

8 The end of Kirill’s rule (ustav) is noted after the Saturday vesper prayer: ‘Гордая Ризлигги и вся низя не гонили на не Погибло, глаголе молитвя за крстюния, дажди и къ бись мица за ево мири. молитка, и стевен молитвя и тако кончаве езтей оны молитви Кирилва... ’ (la misc, fol.162). Another manuscript also mentions Kirill’s rule, ‘и пишемина за радити зеви и за ево християни. И стевен молитвя, тако кончаве езтей молити Кирилва. Тако дадити миция радити зеви и и тако за ево молитвя, не и за човиа и за дати’, (sbornik, 15th-16th centuries, Solov. no.802/912, RNB, fol.173v). Both manuscripts record instructions for genuflection and then cite a short prayer after the hour and vesper prayers to be recited while genuflecting.
experience which draws the suppliant to repentance Kirill employs a gamut of literary devices and conventions. This chapter examines how Kirill uses five key devices to make the spiritual realities of sin, judgement, repentance and heaven more vivid in the experience of the people of Rus': first, the concept of time, second, New Testament stories, third, parts of the human body, fourth, the ordering of language, and fifth, the contrast between heavenly and earthly realities.

Exploiting the correlation between times of day and the material of prayers was a common device. In a wider liturgical context there are prescribed prayers for certain times of day. Prayers recited before going to bed, and after getting up, often use the oncoming darkness of night and the dawn of morning as metaphors for the spiritual life. The darkness of sin and the sleep of death are seen to contrast with the light of God’s ways and the life of the resurrection. The petition ‘покой мне смерть, да не скончай в смерти’ is a typical example. Kirill, too, uses the motifs of night and day, of sleeping and waking on a number of occasions. At the beginning of one morning prayer the speaker addresses his soul, exclaiming, ‘господи, яко я лени се грешеници и дию его, яко сьнь предуваша’.

Far more common than a morning meditation on the beginning of day, are Kirill’s reflections on the close of a day. Several times he expresses his gratitude that God has counted him worthy to live until the end of the day. Kirill underscores the limits imposed on life by the natural boundary

---

9 la misc, fol.153
10 Gebete, Thursday matin, p.298
11 Gebete, Monday matin, p. 251
between day and night, 'сподобившегося недостойного раба Твоего кротости предал в десят н и с обещанной часу показаться славе Твоей' 12. In his vespers prayers the speaker often draws attention to the time of day with expressions such as 'вечернюю Ти принесу молитву' 13 and 'вечернюю службу ясную'. 14 Such references help to anchor the speaker in his own time, impressing on him the spiritual significance of evening and night. A heightened awareness of time coincides with the need for continual self-examination, vital to the process of repentance, Kirill's dominant motif throughout his prayers.

The vespers prayers of the *Iaroslav miscellany* also exploit literal darkness in contrast to heavenly light. In one vespers prayer God's victory is described in terms of brightness and day. 15 Moreover, Christ is called the son of light and day, and the suppliants beseech God that they will not be abandoned in darkness to sleep, but will be watchful so that they can reach the endless day and see the light of God's face. 16 In another prayer for Sunday vespers, the speaker sees the contrast between the brightness of the fiery heavenly beings and the gloom of temptation. 17 This vision prepares him for the slumber and perils of night, anticipating the Monday prayers addressed to the heavenly beings. Evening forms a natural contrast to heaven's unfading light. At this time of day, the speaker's possibly literal experience of darkness makes heaven more attractive by comparison. At the end of one vespers prayer Kirill implores God that he too may be accepted with the righteous into indescribable joy and eternal life, a light which

---

12 *Gebete*, Thursday vespers, p.312. Other instances include: 'и мне смилосердие спокойное до вечера и до восхода солнца до вечера' (*Gebete*, Monday vespers), 'да смилосердие Всевышнего прийдет в течение дня' (*Gebete*, Wednesday vespers, p.294), and 'и мне и тебе и душе спокойное да будет' (*Gebete*, Friday vespers, p.327).
13 *Gebete*, Wednesday vespers, p.293
14 *Gebete*, Monday vespers, p.257
15 'Светлая и днем и днем преставленная просьба извечна', (*la misc.*, fol.134v).
16 'Свет земли и небес... не перегруженный и обезвреженный, но угасший предатель нуть днем живота его в днем чиниму ежеминутную и преставляющий небесах лицу Твоему' (*la misc.*, fol.134v-5).
17 'Надо прежде всего предстать престолу светила угасшего в беде прежде ставленного непоколебимо моста в башне, ведя в' (*la misc.*, fol.163-3v).
never turns to evening. His reference to the unfading light (вечерний свет), an expression also used elsewhere in the *Iaroslav miscellany*, incisively sums up the difference between natural and heavenly light. In this way heaven is made more concrete by comparison with the speaker’s present experience of light and darkness.

In the Tuesday hour prayer the speaker pleads with God to deliver him from assault during the day, ‘и не виShield от стрелы, летящей в день, и от стрелы, ес'/ полуденна’. Compared with the original quotation from the Psalter, ‘You will not fear the terror of the night, nor the arrow that flies by day, nor the pestilence that stalks in darkness, nor the destruction that wastes at noonday’, Kirill’s exclusive concentration on daytime disasters diverges from the psalmist’s original pattern, which juxtaposes the perils of night and day in parallel pairs. Here the speaker’s cry for God not to destroy him in the middle of his days is a cry of particular relevance during the hour prayers.

As well as shaping material to correspond thematically to the time of day, Kirill uses the contrast between times of day to bring spiritual reality into relief. Midday seems like midnight to him under the weight of his sin. Here daylight only accentuates the blackness of his inner state. As the speaker contemplates his sins and the possibility of being cut off prematurely, he envisages a land of total darkness. Confronted with the night of Gehenna, the answer is seen to lie not in natural daylight but in the light of God. He appeals to Jesus as the source, ‘Иисус Благодетели, Ерм Отец,’

---

19 At the end of his Friday vespers prayer Kirill also describes heaven in terms of unfading light. Here undimmed light occurs together with ageless time and eternal life, ‘в небывачных сияннях, ес'/ в бессмертной жизни’ (*Gebete*, Friday vespers, p.328).
20 *Gebete*, Tuesday hour, p.279
21 Psalms 91:5-6
By implication this light will inaugurate an eternal day far superior to the present light of midday. In this way Kirill employs midday as a yardstick against which the two poles of spiritual destiny are measured. Thus only the dawn of the heavenly kingdom is seen to dispel the darkness of Gehenna, a darkness which threatens to blacken the noon of the present. By juxtaposing images of the natural and spiritual world, Kirill is seen to encourage a spirituality which uses the apparent certainties of this world only in order to discern the truer solidity of the next.

Hours of the speaker’s day tend to correspond to the timing of events and parables found in the Gospels. This pattern is also observed in the writings of the early Church, which commemorate Christ’s acts of salvation according to the hours. In *The Apostolic Tradition*, one of the earliest sources documenting liturgical practice, the third hour is consecrated to the crucifixion of Christ, the sixth hour marks the moment when daylight turned to darkness, and prayer at the ninth hour recalls the piercing of Christ’s side. At midnight the faithful are instructed to rise and pray, since this is regarded as the hour of stillness, when all creation praises God and the bridegroom’s cry is heard. At the cock’s crow the faithful are exhorted again to rise and pray, remembering the hour of Peter’s denial, and affirming that by faith they await the eternal light to be fully revealed at the resurrection of the dead. In this way the Church’s calendar captures the significant moments of salvation in the course of each day. Monks, in particular, were expected to follow the hours. The *Iaroslav miscellany*, which is missing the matin section, contains prayers clearly marked with a separate vermilion heading for the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth hours. For each hour the prayers and responses follow the events of the crucifixion. The suppliant is reminded that the ninth hour was the hour of

---

25 *Gebete*, Monday hour, p.256
Christ’s death. At the tenth hour, the speaker envisages Jesus’ body hanging on the cross, first through the eyes of the thief, and then through Mary’s eyes as she looks on. The proverbial eleventh hour causes the speaker to recall Jesus’ parable of the vineyard, and he prays that he too will be reckoned among the labourers hired at the eleventh hour. At the twelfth hour Joseph of Arimathea is portrayed taking Jesus’ body from the cross, wrapping it in graveclothes and putting it in a tomb. Kirill too exploits the hourly pattern. In one vespers prayer he intensifies the experience of the eleventh hour by interlacing three parables, which envisage the oncoming night as a metaphor for the approach of the heavenly kingdom.

Kirill superimposes a sense of passing time so that the deepening night is dramatized literally and metaphorically in the sequence of the three stories.

---

27 ‘Проледали мы те времена, как оправдываем мы перед нашим престолом в слезах, и тьма ужаса и горечи пришло.’ (la misc, fol.19).

28 The thief’s perspective: ‘нам же розыжено наше житие на гробе пвшицем, глаголящ: аще не быт бо гроба впашения присутствия присутствия, но и в скорбях и в отчаянии молимся, и глаголо: о, что мне достояние то не придет в мою руку?’ (la misc, fol.25v).

29 Mary’s perspective: ‘Не идите, и не пойдите, не гошну по рюете, и глаголо: о, что мне достояние и не придет в мою руки?’ (la misc, fol.25v-6).

30 ‘Благодарим Всевышнего, яко онже вложив тело твоему плащаницею натянуло и в гроб носим, а посему плачим’ (la misc, fol.40v-1).

31 Gebete, Sunday vespers, pp.244-5
The scene is set by the speaker’s reference to the last hour of this day, a signal for his meditation on the last days. It was, he recalls, the eleventh hour when Christ accepted the labourer and made him equal with those who had worked all day. He confesses that his laziness has lasted not just one day but his whole life, pointing to the parable as a cameo of his life. Then the scene shifts to the parable of the reluctant guests invited to the king’s banquet. He asks not to be judged like those unwilling guests, whose hard hearts in Jesus’ parable made them snub the royal host. Rather, he pleads for God to look for him at the cross-roads of his life, implicitly comparing himself to the last and final group who are invited to the king’s banquet - the destitute and beggars dragged in from the highways and byways. The petitioner’s banquet is the soul-satisfying food of the Divine Liturgy, an appropriate reference for a Sunday prayer. The third parable of the wise and foolish virgins underlines the passing time and the urgency of being among the guests at the banquet. Already the day has passed and the wise ones are preparing their lamps for the Lord’s midnight arrival. The moment of reckoning is at hand, closer than when the prayer began. By the close of the prayer instead of evening prayer (вечеряя молитва) the speaker now prepares himself for nocturnal prayers (нощная молитвы). The dramatization of time’s relentless passage heightens the impression created in all three parables that the Lord’s coming is certain and imminent. In this way the speaker is enjoined to redouble his efforts to prepare for the midnight arrival.

While the evening setting of vesper prayers naturally recalls the eleventh hour, Kirill also alludes to the eleventh hour in his matin prayer for Tuesday, a day dedicated to John the Baptist and calling for heartfelt repentance. Kirill conjures up a picture of what would happen if he were excluded from the heavenly kingdom - the onslaught of darkness after the eleventh hour and the desolation of the guests who missed the sumptuous banquet. Lest this be his fate, Kirill prays that his soul may wear the easy yoke and receive his wages from the Lord, 'ΔΑ ΠΙΝΗ ΟΤΡΟΥΝΤΗ ΕΖ.
Kirill fuses two images so that the setting is still that of the labourers at the eleventh hour in the vineyard, but the work is the easy yoke which Jesus offers to those labouring and heavy-laden souls. The fact that Kirill mentions the eleventh hour in his matin prayer underlines the exigency of repentance and forms a prelude to his depiction of the Day of Judgement. In keeping with a spirituality which focusses on repentance, Kirill is seen to make judgement imminent by imposing on his material a sense of time passing that seems almost palpable.

In addition to the eleventh hour, which is readily grasped as the hour before midnight and symbolically before judgement, Kirill explores other less obvious links between Biblical events and the moment of prayer. For example, he matches the specific day of the week on which an incident occurs with the day prescribed for his prayers. In the Saturday hour prayer Kirill describes how Jesus healed the paralyzed man who arrived via the roof. Spiritually the speaker compares his condition to a sick man, for he too is paralyzed by many sins and immobilized by despair and also looks to Jesus for a miracle. As if to stress the parallel with the paralyzed man, Kirill records that the miracle took place on a Sabbath, the same day for which his prayer is composed - Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath. None of the Gospel accounts, however, specify the Sabbath. This parallel appears to have been introduced in order to link the speaker’s time with events from the Gospels, underlining the potential for those same miracles to be re-enacted in the speaker’s life.

In the Sunday hour prayer, Kirill specifies the hour of prayer as the sixth. He then recounts three incidents from Jesus’ life which he assigns to the sixth hour; his post-resurrection appearance to his apostles, his visit to Zachaeus’ house and his conversation with the Samaritan woman. His

32 Gebete, Tuesday matin, p.275
33 ‘Не прем яже, молящеся Ти си къ гладину честуя сего дня’ (Gebete, Sunday hour, pp.240-1).
repeated assertion ‘въ сей часъ’ reiterates the fact that each incident took place at the sixth hour. The Gospel accounts, however, specify only that Jesus’ meeting with the Samaritan woman took place at the sixth hour. By linking all the miracles to the sixth hour, the gap between the speaker and Gospel narrative is narrowed. As in the previous example, Christ is seen to perform the same miracles in the speaker’s daily spiritual life as he did in the Gospels. Thus Kirill advocates a spirituality which encourages the supplicant to relive the parables and stories of Christ.

‘Now’ and ‘today’ are dotted throughout Kirill’s sermons, bringing the Gospel narratives closer to the time of the preacher and his listeners. Although prayers are inescapably in the present - they represent direct communication with God rather than being mediated through the preacher - ‘now’ is also an important word. First, it draws attention to the desperation felt by the petitioner in his current situation. For example, one prayer begins ‘како сие падение нынѣ разумѣ?’. Second, the speaker contrasts the past with the present ‘now’, both in a negative sense of his former condition compared with his present state (Твой сынъ былъ порожденъ въ купели духовнымъ, нынѣ же рась грешный) and, in a positive sense for the apostle Peter who weighs past suffering against present joy (за имя его святос узы помнами, радость ненаглаголанномъ, нынѣ на небесехъ у престола славы святыхъ Троица вселаняща). Third, ‘now’ signals the moment of the speaker’s entreaty and his decision to turn to Christ, ‘рекый благословенными усты Своими: возвоми Мя, избавлю ты, и нынѣ зову и вопию не престалъ’. By quoting Jesus’ words as direct speech, Kirill also heightens the effect of now.

34 See S.V. Kozlov, ‘Iz наблюдений над сюжетно-композиционными и стилистическими особенностями ораторской прозы древней Руси (“Слово в недели тсветоносную” Кирillo Туровскаго и византийско-болгарская традиция)’, Voprosy susheta i kompozitsii. Mezhvuzovskii sbornik, Gor’kii 1982, p.17
35 Gebete, Friday matin, p.313
36 Gebete, Sunday matin, p.236
37 Gebete, Thursday matin, p.300. ‘With joy inexpressible’ could refer either to Peter’s joy in suffering, or his joy at being in heaven. Possibly the ambiguity is deliberate.
38 Gebete, Monday vespers, pp.257-8
In conjunction with ‘now’, Kirill uses the expressions ‘until now’ (ДОНИНЬЕ) and ‘from now on’ (ОТЪ НЫНИЕ). ‘Until now’ can encompass the whole of the speaker’s past life as he confesses his wrongdoing ‘Отъ юности и ДОНИНЬЕ’, and, in a wider sense, spans time from the beginning of the world until the present moment, ‘Началъ мира и ДОНИНЬЕ, и единожды грешника, гдже непрестанъ сгоршавшаго’.40 ‘From now on’ generally indicates the moment of repentance and a desire for change, ‘ОТЪ НЫНИЕ Останися ныситихъ похотей’.41 In this way ‘ДОНИНЬЕ’ and ‘ОТЪ НЫНИЕ’ describe time from the beginning of creation until now, and from now into eternity.

Lastly, prayers often close with the familiar words ‘НЫНИЕ И ПРИСНО И ЕВЕК И ЕКОМЪ’. With these words each prayer is predetermined, for, regardless of the present predicament or past sin, the prayer must finish in the ‘now’ of sacred time extending into eternity. Thus ‘now’ becomes a marker for the now of spiritual experience as well as the now of ‘sacred’ time. Conceptually ‘НЫНѢ’, ‘ДОНИНЬЕ’ and ‘ОТЪ НЫНИЕ’ are important words for a spirituality which demands a constant inner response, where past deeds affect the present and future, and the present response of prayer alters the past and future. No matter that the prayers are recited down the centuries, the moment now is treasured anew in Kirill’s prayers as a moment of spiritual significance.

With the past and the future wrapped up in the understanding of now, it is important that they too can be experienced with immediacy. One way Kirill juggles time is by constantly alternating and interlocking the past, present and future tenses. The Friday matin prayer exemplifies this technique, illustrating how Kirill employs tenses to build up the different stages of repentance. Five rhetorical questions begin the prayer. Although on one level the answer to these questions is self-evident, on another level

---

39 Gebete, Tuesday matin, p 274
40 Gebete, Tuesday matin, p.274
41 Gebete, Thursday matin, p.299
they unleash a form of self-interrogation which electrifies the present moment. Here the courtroom is held in the speaker’s own mind. He is agitated by the thought of judgement so that the future dominates the present. Finding no respite in his past, for it offers no example of true repentance, nor in the present, which is likewise unrelieved by true repentance, the speaker portrays himself as locked in a circle of wrongdoing, ‘аще бо часъ каятъ, то братья блюкнесткую’. Recalling the past, he uses three reflexive verbs to describe how he succumbed to temporal comforts, ‘уклонихся’, ‘праставихся’ and ‘приложихся’. Turning again to consider the present, the speaker sees only obstacles to repentance and laments that if he stretches out his hands, he will pollute the very air. The extremity of his predicament leads him back to the intensity of rhetorical questions. What word can he use, he asks himself, if his mouth is unclean, and if he cannot offer that, what can he give? He admits that he has not cultivated the ways of repentance but instead has chosen sinful ways. The verbs he uses to describe his wrongdoing are starker and twice he confesses to destroying what was good (погубилъ). The enemy’s control over him is now more evident than at first, with his mind to given over to earthly things. His exclamation, ‘въ мѣнъ’, exposes the pain of the present moment but at the same time the speaker sounds a note of hope when he cries to God, addressing him as, ‘богатый милосты, благый щедрыами’. Confessing his past sin, the speaker admits that he still has not returned, and therefore sees only punishment and eternal torment ahead. Unlike New Testament penitents who were forgiven, he confesses that he has failed to
truly repent and identifies instead with the archetypal murderer, Cain. This brands the speaker a condemned man and he decides to admit his evil deeds like Lamech, who was prepared to acknowledge his sin, though not in repentance to God.\(^5\) He sums up the precipitating crisis as follows, ‘ве во время жизни мое сокращается; скверны же душа моя умножилась’.\(^6\) Time, far from offering healing only exacerbates his troubles. A microcosm of human history is seen to be enacted in the speaker’s life, for after Cain’s murderous act sin increases and man’s lifespan is cut short. Identifying himself with the deeds of all those who sinned before and under the law, the speaker compares himself with those who faced judgement - the people of Noah’s day, the builders of the tower of Babel, and the Sodomites. This leaves him gripped with the fear of impending judgement.\(^7\) Alongside Abraham and the patriarchs he sees himself as an alien, for by accepting the evil deeds of sinners (ве во время жизни мое сокращается),\(^8\) he has rejected the virtues of the righteous (и смерть нрава праведныхъ не всплыти).\(^9\) The repetition of the verb ‘всплыти’ emphasizes the speaker’s choice. His inability and refusal to extricate himself from his dire situation is highlighted by the verb ‘пребыти’. First, he describes how he remained (пребылъ) in the fire of passion, a metaphorical Sodom and Gomorrah, and second, how he remained (пребылъ) accursed like Dathan and Abiram who rebelled against Moses and were swallowed up by the earth. By identifying with Biblical characters from the past who were judged, the speaker’s own judgement is brought closer. Now he sees himself standing before God, certain of judgement, only uncertain of the day or hour.\(^5\) He reasons that if he does not now accept God’s just punishments, then he will fall into the hands of the living God. He confronts

\(^{55}\) ‘И пребылъ на меня злая мысль’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.316).
\(^{66}\) Gebete, Friday matin, p.316
\(^{77}\) ‘И днемъ и ночью творилъ святое венозное, въ названъ ми жизнью бывши’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.316).
\(^{88}\) Gebete, Friday matin, p.316
\(^{99}\) Gebete, Friday matin, p.317
\(^{50}\) ‘Не идь въ дни, ни часъ, когда ипоть зналъ и зная повержь мое’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.317).
himself with what separation from God would mean - worms, fire and the
devil's boastful words. The present and unresolved choice of his destiny is
underlined by the two contrasting uses of 'awaiting' (ожидающий). God
awaits his repentance (ожидающий Богъ многое покаянія), while the worms await
his body (черві, ожидающіе многое телеси). Faced with these alternatives, the
speaker resumes the questioning which marked his earlier turmoil, but to
these questions he finally gives an answer, 'да что сотворю, не ведаю, и къ кому
прислужу, излаганія проситъ, такою къ Тебѣ Творче мой!'.\footnote{Gebete, Friday matin, p.318} This signals the turning-
point of his prayer. He affirms God's love and cites the much-quoted verse,
'же не радующися о смерти грѣшницы, не о обреченій живота его вселянись'.\footnote{Gebete, Friday matin, p.318}

Kirill's manipulation of time and tense intensifies the speaker's
experience of repentance. When one tense predominates it tends to highlight
a particular stage of repentance. The present tense depicts both dismay and
supplication, the future tense - inevitable judgement or bliss, the past tense
portrays his sin, examples from the lives of the wicked and the righteous, as
well as Christ's miracles and death. As the prayer progresses, the mix of
past, present and future changes key. Initially the present tense shows the
speaker in a state of confusion and paralysis in which all his responses
prove inadequate. As he muses on future judgement, the present becomes
fearful. Even in the middle of his agitation, however, he remembers God's
love. Increasingly the present tense expresses his confession and his
petitions as he emerges on the other side of repentance.\footnote{The power of the crucifixion is experienced as a present reality when the speaker envisages Christ's blood flowing out to cleanse him, 'не смиряти кнѣ искрь истинную Святію Ти крѣвь' (Gebete, Friday matin, p.321). Christ's ability to act in the present is underlined by the speaker's declaration, 'вс въ мгнови, въкъ увѣрѣн, твърдящъ' (Gebete, Friday matin, p.321). He concludes the prayer in the eternal present of God's mercy and salvation which sums up the essence of his
prayer, 'ты не смирать и окаяніи душа наша всегда, мнѣ вѣрную и къ всѣмъ вѣрнымь' (Gebete, Friday matin, p.324).} The past tense at
first exposes his sin and the sin of mankind from Cain on. Once the speaker
has contemplated Christ's salvation and repented, he can speak of his

\footnote{Gebete, Friday matin, p.318}
\footnote{Gebete, Friday matin, p.318}
\footnote{The power of the crucifixion is experienced as a present reality when the speaker envisages Christ's blood flowing out to cleanse him, 'не смиряти кнѣ искрь истинную Святію Ти крѣвь' (Gebete, Friday matin, p.321). Christ's ability to act in the present is underlined by the speaker's declaration, 'вс въ мгнови, въкъ увѣрѣн, твърдящъ' (Gebete, Friday matin, p.321). He concludes the prayer in the eternal present of God's mercy and salvation which sums up the essence of his
prayer, 'ты не смирать и окаяніи душа наша всегда, мнѣ вѣрную и къ всѣмъ вѣрнымь' (Gebete, Friday matin, p.324).}
turning to God in the past tense. Subsequently, the speaker's use of the past tense stresses his penitence, ‘къ Тебѣ есі прибегъ и мнѣ душа моя возвѣдохъ и рѣшъ престрѣхъ’. In this way the past tense of confession is displaced increasingly by the past of the righteous and finally by Christ's miracles and acts of salvation as recounted in the New Testament. Thus Kirill encourages the individual to relate his spirituality to the whole of Biblical history and to be diligent in repentance, since the passing of every moment is seen as a fresh opportunity which could affect past, present and future.

Considered as a whole, Kirill's Friday matin prayer reveals a more complex approach to repentance than a schematic outline of sin confessed and sin forgiven. The speaker begins with the realization of his inability to repent and the continued enslavement to evil. His repentance is played out through the characters of Biblical history. While the overall shape of the prayer encourages the process of repentance, the constant interlacing of tenses does not allow the speaker to become complacent. Kirill's verbal artistry is apparent in the immediacy and intensity of experience he creates in his prayers through a combination of traditional devices.

A comparison of Kirill's Friday matin prayer with two other longer penitential prayers in the *Iaroslav miscellany* which employ similar devices, is illuminating. For example, one prayer also begins with a string of questions uttered at crisis-point, ‘кто мнѣ грѣшникъ, что виновна душа моя? Что мнѣ грѣшникъ, какъ виновна вѣра моя грѣшный тамо? Какъ мнѣ грѣшный быть къ окаяніи? Какъ мнѣ дать слово грѣшному монахъ?’ The cascade of questions continues so that by the end of the prayer the

---

54 A list of verbs in the aorist tell the story of what Christ did in the lives of the penitents: ‘освяти’, ‘покаялъ’, ‘спасъ’, ‘чисти’ and ‘свяси... пристанника суети’. The speaker declares Jesus' victory over the devil by using verbs of the past perfect, ‘увидѣлъ синь', ‘вздѣлалъ синь', ‘вздѣлалъ синь’, ‘вздѣлалъ синь’ and ‘вздѣлалъ синь’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.321). Rozhdestvenskaia notes that Kirill uses the perfect tense in reference to God's actions which transcend time, but the aorist tense in relation to the mortal body (Rozhdestvenskaia, 'Nekotorye osobennosti', p.101).

55 Friday matin, p.323

56 *la misc*, fol.32-2v
petitioner still dreads eternal fire. By contrast, self-questioning in Kirill’s Friday matin prayer leads the petitioner to a place where the questions and self-accusations are hushed by his repentance. Another penitential prayer from the Laroslav miscellany attributed to John Chrysostom, adopts a more conventional shape. Praise is followed by confession of past sin which is expressed by clusters of verbs in the past tense. Once the speaker realizes the full horror of impending judgement, questions over his fate pour out. Having confessed his inability to repent truly without God’s help, the petitioner asks for God’s help and forgiveness. A request for the saints’ intercession and communal confession follows. Although this prayer resembles Kirill’s Friday matin prayer in its appreciation of repentance as a process, it does not exploit the switch between tenses in the same way. Kirill’s change of tenses helps to intensify the harrowing spiritual realities, while charting the course of how his past, present and future are realigned through repentance.

Kirill’s use of material from the Gospels is also designed to highlight the relevance and immediacy of the spiritual world. Prayers in general often use comparison to help the reader identify with Biblical characters and events. A comparison can hinge around one common point, for example in a prayer attributed to St Gregory, the writer entreats God to hear him as he heard Tabitha and Sarah, ‘ты слышал их, как и я слышал тебя и тебя’. By repeating the verb ‘to hear’ he underlines the comparison. While Kirill also employs straightforward comparisons, he often elaborates and intertwines passages. Similar patterning is also evident in Kirill’s use of allegory and symbol.

In the final part of Kirill’s prayer for Tuesday matin, the speaker compares himself to well-known New Testament penitents - the prodigal

---

57 "Ψιγ τοὺς τῶν, ὅτε προσέρχεσθαι παλαιότερην και ζωήν οἰκονόμων... τὰς ἡμᾶς;" (La misc, fol.36)
58 For example ‘γεραισθήσομαι, περιθώριον καὶ προθέτωμα τοῦ’ (La misc, fol.43).
59 La misc, prayer attributed to St Gregory, fol.74v.
son, the Canaanite woman and the leper - repeating the same words spoken by those who met Jesus and found forgiveness and healing:

Kirill creates a pattern of expectancy comprising three elements: a verb of response 'возвращаюсь', 'молю' and 'безис', the comparison, 'яко блаудный сынъ', 'яко Хананьева' and 'яко прокаженный', and their petition. The shock comes when the speaker interrupts the pattern with a negative comparison: 'не глаголе, яко раскаленный: Господи, чадоюка не имашь'. This leads the speaker to declare who Jesus is and what he has done for him, 'Ты бо еси Сынь человеческий, мени ради пластю обложися и немощь естества нашего понесе'. After the speaker's declaration 'Ты бо еси Сынь человеческий' there follows a reference to four of Jesus' miracles, mirroring the four petitions. Once again the speaker describes the four miracles in such a manner that he creates a pattern of expectancy, 'иже сына владыча на погребение несома воскреси, четвержненаго лазаря изъ гроба воскреси, слепымъ словомъ еси отвере, и кровоточивую прикоснувшиесь ризу чисти'. The regular beat of the aorist verbal ending each clause is broken only by the reference to the dying thief, 'и разбойника, въ единъ часъ исповѣдавшагося, прѣявъ еси и разгневанникъ сътворилъ.
Overall two sets of parallels are created, first, the words of people who sought Jesus, and second, the miracles which he performed. Both times the fifth example introduces a surprise element. In the second set of miracles the fifth example shows a crowning illustration of God’s mercy to the dying thief. In this way Kirill’s use of comparison is seen to create interlacing textual patterns which link the miracles and stories cited.

The speaker of Kirill’s prayers often enters the parables and Jesus’ miracles so that they are re-enacted in his life through allegory. For medieval writers no sharp line of demarcation appears to have existed between the historical report of Jesus’ life and his parables. Both the events of Jesus’ life and his own parables are regarded equally as conveying spiritual truth relevant for all time. Kirill’s prayer for Saturday hour depicts the two halves of his sinful condition - paralysis and tumult - which are illustrated through two of Christ’s miracles, his healing of the paralyzed man and the stilling of the storm:

The physical states of paralysis and storm are fused with Kirill’s perception of two spiritual states. Here correspondence is established by words used to describe the miracles which are then reinterpreted in their new context. The

---

64 Gebete, Tuesday matin, p.278
65 In Kirill’s sermons Gospel stories are also interpreted allegorically. In one sermon describing Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, Kirill interprets the coats thrown on the donkey as apostolic good deeds, the coats laid on the road as the rulers’ almsgiving and integrity, and the branches strewn along the road as the ordinary people and sinners, who level their path with repentance. See Eremin, ‘Literaturne nasledie’, TOL, 13, ‘В НАДИБЕ ЦЕЛОМУ О КАЖДОМУ БЛАГАЕМУМ’ (p.410).
66 D.S. Likhachev, Poetika drevnerusskoj literatury, Moscow, 1978, p.307, comments that Old and New Testament events occupy a special place in medieval understanding. Although they relate to the past, he observes that they are perceived as present realities.
67 Gebete, Saturday hour, pp.343-4
paralyzed man is transmuted into the speaker’s numbed and despairing soul, while the waves metamorphose into a tempest of unclean thoughts. More specifically, paralysis is interpreted in terms of sin, ‘РЖКАГАЕНА СПЫЩА. МНИЯМИ грешиы’, and the sea’s waves are reinterpreted firstly as the storm of the speaker’s passions (бруто страстию мовут), and then as the waves of his unclean thoughts (ваны... нечистых ми помышлений). Significantly, elements in each story remain unchanged, for example Christ as the agent of change and the word as his instrument ‘оломьв’. The verbs ‘встанти’ and ‘запрети’ are also repeated (встанти... мем... Твею милость встань; запрети воламь морским... запрети всу). By preserving these components Kirill highlights the parallels between the speaker’s predicament and the Gospel stories, pointing to Christ’s unchanging power. Other links are made between the Gospel stories and the speaker’s experience. Christ is addressed as healer and master of the storm, ‘едине премудре, врхно душамь и теламь’ thus forming a bridge between both stories. Another bridge is established by Kirill’s plea that the demon should not oppress him but rather draw back from his infirmity. The word ‘непомощь’ communicates both the physical infirmity of the paralyzed man as well as internal weakness felt by a storm of wrong desires and thoughts. While leaving the key words of each story unchanged, Kirill alters the context to describe the speaker’s spiritual condition.

As well as the use of allegory and parallel timing, verbal correspondences are used to make each story apply to the speaker more directly. In the first allusion to Jesus’ post-resurrection appearance to the disciples, they appear sad (печалны ми сущемь), until Jesus turns their sorrow to joy (премьше скоре и въ на радость). The speaker picks up these expressions in his petition, ‘премьше и мою скоре духомь... и печалы избави грешины’. Jesus’ comment to Zachaeus, ‘даже спасение дому твоему’, is echoed in turn by the speaker who implores Christ, ‘даже спасение душевному’.

---

68 Gebete, Sunday hour, p.241
Parallels are also established with the Samaritan woman through recurring words and motifs. Three elements are repeated - a conversation, Jesus’ knowledge of the speaker’s heart and the answer found in the thirst-quenching water of life.

The expression ‘беседа молитвы’ relates the speaker’s prayer to Jesus’ conversation with the Samaritan woman, while the exclamation ‘сий Господи Боже мой!’ creates a suitable context for the unbosoming of his heart’s secrets. Kirill’s allusion to the ‘living waters’ is developed in a different way from the Gospel narrative. In the Gospel of St John Jesus promises the Samaritan woman water which will ever satisfy, an illustration of spiritual life which Jesus gives from within, ‘whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him will never thirst; the water that I shall give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life’.

By contrast the speaker of Kirill’s prayer asks only for a drop of God’s mercy. That such a small quantity is enough becomes a measure of its greatness. Petitioning Christ to extinguish the sinful fire of his soul also relates the symbol of water to repentance. A network of verbal correspondences is seen to reinforce the link between the Gospel narratives and the speaker’s experience, retaining Kirill’s focus on repentance.

Kirill’s allusion to the story of the prodigal son in his Friday matin prayer develops one key symbol, that of food. He confesses:

---

69 Gebete, Sunday hour, p.241
70 John 4:14
Three times Kirill refers to food - the angelic food which he has despised, the unlawful food he has eaten and the swine’s husks of temporal pleasures. In Jesus’ story the husks are fed to the swine, and only the son’s gnawing hunger makes them seem appetizing. In Kirill’s prayer food becomes a symbol of sin and the verbs ‘исповеваться’ and ‘питаться’ reinforce the sensuality of the symbol. The noun ‘бездес’ describes sin, equating food’s sour taste with sin’s bitter reward. This contrasts with the sweetness promised by temporal pleasures, ‘временных сладостей’, but belied by his subsequent hunger. Kirill inserts the maxim which lies at the heart of his food metaphor, ‘не в часе точно накладите, а в веки муучение предастъ; мысленные же гладье любы изменены и дескак не возвратихся, яко древле блудный сынъ’. By drawing such a comparison Kirill makes the contrast clearer, for unlike the prodigal son at this stage in the prayer the speaker has still not returned, malnourished by sin’s enervating food.

Kirill’s selectivity in handling Biblical stories is striking in the way he develops different aspects of the same story as they become relevant. Twice Kirill recalls the story of the good Samaritan in his prayers. In the Friday matin prayer the speaker pictures himself in a valley of sin where he speaks as the man who has been robbed and beaten:

не презри мене въ скверномъ припутьи, въ греховный удали, въ мысленный разбойники впадающи и въ еякихъ добродетелей отъ нихъ сведена и страстью любы уязвена и неначально больша душевныхъ похотніемъ преминешь іероимъ ума моего.

71 Gebete, Friday matin, p.315
72 Gebete, Friday matin, p.320
While the verbs 'επέδωκε', 'συνεχίσε' and 'γράφε' mirror the sequence of verbs used in the Gospel account, 'γέμισεν τον άλατον... και ο μαύρος αλάτον' the story also becomes one of intellectual sin by describing the robbers as 'μικρὰντα' and the priest as 'ίχαρον ούμα μου'. Here the speaker does not choose to dwell on the parable's happy ending. By contrast, the Tuesday matin prayer frames the story so that the emphasis falls on himself as the injured man, and Christ as the good Samaritan, doctor and innkeeper:

САМЪ ЖЕ, ГОСПАДИ МОЙ ИСУС ХРИСТЪ, ЯКО САМАРЯНИНЪ, ВЗЯЛИ МЯ НА СВОЙ СКЪТЪ И ПРИНЕСЛИ МЯ ВЪ РГ. ГОСТИНИЩЬ... ТЫ, ЯКОГДА ГОСТИНИЩЪ И ВРАЧЪ, ПРИЛЪЖИ МНЕ, ВЗЈАЙ НА МЯ ТЕБОЮ МИЛЪСТЬ.

Retaining the same elements as the Gospel account - putting the bruised man on the Samaritan’s donkey, taking him to the inn and anointing him with oil - the speaker emphasizes Christ’s all-encompassing role. Rather than retell the whole story, Kirill often selects an element which develops his point so that the suppliant is guided through the process of repentance.

An additional way in which spiritual reality in prayers is made immediate to the suppliant, is through accompanying bodily action. In general these actions usually take the form of a prescribed number of genuflections and instructions about whether they should be done to the ground or to the waist. Kirill’s prayers in the Iaroslav miscellany are supplemented with words to be recited while genuflecting (as mentioned above), though it is possible that these instructions may not belong to him.

An additional way in which spiritual reality in prayers is made immediate to the suppliant, is through accompanying bodily action. In general these actions usually take the form of a prescribed number of genuflections and instructions about whether they should be done to the ground or to the waist. Kirill’s prayers in the Iaroslav miscellany are supplemented with words to be recited while genuflecting (as mentioned above), though it is possible that these instructions may not belong to him.

---

74 Gebete, Tuesday matin, p.278
75 'εδάφησαν έριν έν μέμει το ποδί του έν αύτίν το ιερά έκ ένα έ
76 For example, at the close of the Sunday hour prayer the speaker is instructed to genuflect thrice to the waist, saying 'ΨΕΒΑΣΜΕΝΟ ΜΗΝ, ΧΡΙΣΤΟ, ΤΗΛΙ ΚΑΙ ΔΑΜΑΡΙΣΜΟΝ ΑΓΑΠΑΛ ΜΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΟΜΑ ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΙ ΜΑ ΚΑΝΩΝΙΩΝΑ' (la misc, fol.91v). It is conceivable that Kirill wrote these notes, if he composed a weekly prayer cycle in the form of a rule. A second manuscript (Sol.802/912) also refers to Kirill’s rule and intersperses the prayers with a nearly word for word rendering of the extra prayers prescribed during genuflection, as well as inserting troparia after the matin prayers.
Returning to the texts of Kirill’s prayers, the body is still seen as an organ of expression in the spiritual world, but the different parts are understood often in a metaphorical rather than a literal sense. Here Kirill follows a long tradition of Biblical and ecclesiastical literature in which the heart and soul metaphorically have eyes and ears.\(^7^7\)

Soul, heart, mind and spirit are traditionally key elements in man’s spiritual make-up. Kirill refers occasionally to the spirit, but gives far more prominence to man’s soul, heart and mind.\(^7^8\) In contrast to man’s soul against which the speaker sins, his mind tends to be responsible for promoting sin and he describes it as ‘самовластный’.\(^7^9\) The soul is seen to be vulnerable to enemy attacks, to illness, injury, decay and feeling.\(^8^0\) It, too, experiences hunger, pain and thirst. Not that Kirill separates the soul from the body so that they function independently from each other, on the contrary, man’s physical and spiritual condition are often regarded as interdependent. For example, the speaker implores the Theotokos to heal the wounds of soul and body in the same breath,\(^8^1\) and when he kneels, his body and soul kneel together, ‘покланяя коленя телечин и душевен’.\(^8^2\)

Likewise, in the prayer attributed to John Chysostom in the Iaroslav miscellany the speaker states ‘покланяю коленя телечин и душевен’.\(^8^3\) Often

\(^7^7\) The Psalter is full of literal and metaphorical references to the body, for example the psalmist’s cry, ‘open my eyes, that I may behold wonderful things out of thy law’ (Psalms 119:18).

\(^7^8\) The speaker mentions his spirit when quoting a well-known petition from the Psalter, ‘чисто очищай во мне, Боже, и ДУХ ПРЯВ ОСЕНИ И В СИНЕ ЧЕРН’ (Gebete, Saturday matin, p.332).

\(^7^9\) He repents of his sin committed against his soul, ‘многа прегрешя покланяя, омыва ятельных на вине грешь мои душе’ (Gebete, Thursday matin, p.306), and in another prayer he confesses to the Theotokos that he has sinned and broken the commands of her Son ‘самовластный умный’ (Gebete, Wednesday matin, p.280).

\(^8^0\) The images which Kirill uses to describe the spiritual attacks on the soul depict it as a living organism rather than as an abstract phenomenon: ‘надстрашая ми во для жадных исчистити, душыю вытруся святоспеченный редь во оклевннии ми душ’ (Gebete, Tuesday hour, p.280). The soul is given spatial dimension in Kirill’s image of the thief who lies in wait, ‘так же душа моя кается во гнездо сердца мие, жадный падена бранин... и течется моя имение врь моя вкуситити’ (Gebete, Tuesday vesper, p.283).

\(^8^1\) ‘Душевенныя и телечинныя, яко недалёкий преч’ (Gebete, Wednesday matin, p.288). He seeks healing for ‘душевенныя и телечинныя, и принося телечинныя неты’ (Gebete, Thursday matin, p.300).

\(^8^2\) Gebete, Thursday matin, p.303

\(^8^3\) La misc, fol.42v
the soul and heart appear together, both in need of healing, 'исцеляя болезни сердца моего; яркую стрипту души моей.' By contrast with man, Christ’s body is seen as blameless, and in the Friday hour prayer the speaker seeks the remedy for the ills afflicting body and soul in Christ’s crucifixion. Thus in Christ’s passion he seeks healing for the passions of his heart, ‘наш рани страсть принять, исцеляя страсти сердца моего.’ In this way Christ’s crucifixion is seen to have a bearing on his present experience, affecting body and soul.

In prayers it is customary to associate particular parts of the body with individual spiritual attributes. In Kirill’s prayer cycle he uses this device fairly extensively, so that lips are designed for praise, eyes to look to God and to cry with tears of repentance, and his hands to be lifted up to God. His feet are to run or walk in the path of God’s commands, standing firm on the rock of repentance and of faith, while his heart fears God and his soul is indwelt by the Holy Spirit. In one of the vespers prayers he asks God to give his eyes a light sleep, and also makes supplication for other parts of his body such as his ears, his pupils, his nostrils and his throat.

One part of the body to which Kirill repeatedly returns and which is central for the act of praying, is his lips. The speaker is deeply aware that the organ

84 Gebete, Thursday hour, p.308. A hint of the close-knit relationship between the soul and heart is evident in the interchange of words. In this instance illness is linked to his soul and wounds to his heart, ‘инки стрипы сердца моего и болезнь души моей’ (Gebete, Wednesday hour, p.291).
85 Gebete, Friday hour, p.325
86 Two examples of the imperative to praise with the one’s lips include, ‘уста наполни Евфимия Твоего’ (Gebete, Wednesday vespers, p.294) and ‘да исповедует уста мои множества милости Твоей’ (Gebete, Sunday matin, p.239). Acknowledging that he has broken God’s commands, he says of his eyes ‘да твое ни на мою сми мою весть немья’ (Gebete, Tuesday vespers, p.282). In another prayer he exclaims, ‘кто дасть чиста меня слова, да се пачу къ миастевну Бого’ (Gebete, Monday matin, p.251). For his hands he prays ‘насам мои руки къ Твоим прости’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.322). He petitions God for his feet ‘углоди нозь ми на пленивямъ конечни, на тврдымъ пяры Твои кабин’ (Gebete, Saturday vespers, pp.346-7) and ‘постави нозь ми на кабинъ гедани’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.322).
87 For his ears he prays ‘слухъ же уши мио да загалотись божественною Ти запредели’ (Gebete, Friday matin, p.322). He implores God to protect his soul from the enemy’s sedition, ‘да дрета душницы ми ствтет сужале Твое’ (Gebete, Saturday matin, p.332). His nostrils absorb the stench of his deeds ‘снарал дрелъ ноза мио естица ноздры ми’ (Gebete, Tuesday vespers, p.282) and concerning his throat he echoes the words of the psalmist, ‘спади глотъ мои, овес Твои’ (Gebete, Tuesday hour, p.280).
which enables him to pray is unclean before God and therefore his prayer is unacceptable. He does not take for granted his right to speak before God and the Theotokos. In one prayer he asks the Theotokos, not to despise the movement of his lips but to accept the sighs of his heart. The Old Testament figure of Hannah was also noted for the sighs of her heart which resulted in her voiceless prayer, leaving the priest Eli perplexed. By contrast Kirill underlines the purity of Jesus’ lips and words by petitions such as ‘помяни, Господа, пречистыхъ Твоихъ устъ глаголы’.

Rogachevskaia notes two instances in Kirill’s prayers where parts of the body are placed hierarchically. In the Wednesday vespers prayer the speaker moves from his feet to his flesh, his heart, his lips, his tongue, his soul and finally, to his mind. Likewise in the Monday vespers prayer he progresses from his feet to his hands, his lips, to his heart and his soul. These two lists appear to be strategically placed in the context of each prayer. In the second prayer the speaker begins by asking God to make his prayer acceptable, and this petition leads to his desire to consecrate his body to God. Evidently prayer is to affect his whole body. In the Wednesday vespers prayer the speaker closes by asking for cleansing which affects his whole body so that he might be pleasing to God, ‘господа, глаголы устъ Твоя’.

Although Kirill’s prayers are often highly ordered in reference to the body, they rarely seem overly schematic. For example, a

88 He cries ‘не пренебрегайте на мена, многие глаголы пред Тебем’ (Gebete, Saturday vespers, p.346) and to the Theotokos ‘не пренебрегайте многих глаголы пред Тебем’ (Gebete, Wednesday matin, p.291).
89 ‘Не пренебрегайте нечистых устъ Твоя, не пренебрегайте глаголы устъ Твоя’ (Gebete, Wednesday matin, p.286).
90 ‘Hannah was speaking in her heart; only her lips moved, and her voice was not heard; therefore Eli took her to be a drunken woman’ (1 Samuel 1:13). I doubt that Kirill was referring to hesychast prayer which only became well-known among the Orthodox Slavs later in the fourteenth century.
91 Gebete, Sunday matin, p.239 In Kirill’s Monday matin prayer he describes the angels as beings who praise God with incorporeal lips, ‘нечеловеческия и небесенними устами трезветы верующи пещь’ (p.249).
92 Rogachevskaia, Molitvoslovnoe tvorchestvo, ch.2, p.14, discerns a ‘ladder’ which ascends from the ‘flesh’, incorporating feet, body, heart, lips and tongue to the ‘spiritual organs’, namely the soul, mind and intellect.
93 ‘Исправи мнемету ми, яко кадима пред Тебем’ (Gebete, Monday vespers, p.257).
94 Gebete, Wednesday vespers, p.294
confession in the _Iaroslav miscellany_, by contrast draws attention schematically to each part of the body in turn:

- согрешших умных и умных монмы, согрешних языком и горанем монмы,
- согрешних языком и перььыми монмы, согрешних срдцем и мыслыми монмы,
- согрешних руками и ногами монмы, согрешних костям и плотью монмы,
- согрешних мозгом и составной жилом, согрешных въсьмь тельмь монмы.  

In Kirill’s prayers parts of the body tend to be associated with movement or states of being. The speaker’s heart and diseased soul intercede vigorously, ‘стену изъ глубины сердечных и слезы боезнаемь ми душь’.  

Here the outward manifestations of the body’s anguish, groaning and weeping, become expressions of his heart and soul. A less usual form ‘изъ глубины сердца’, in place of ‘изъ глубины сердечных’, also make the dimensions of the heart more spatial, contributing to the way spiritual reality appears immediate and concrete. Thus Kirill exploits conventional approaches to Christian spirituality, at times likening spiritual experience to the workings of the body and yet at the same time showing an appreciation of the body’s role in expressing prayer.

Far from presenting a spontaneous and unrestrained outburst of feeling, Kirill’s prayers, as already demonstrated by his use of time and Biblical narrative, are highly patterned. Although Kirill’s prayers often reveal intricate organization, the overall effect is that the suppliant grasps the sense more quickly. Moreover, by organizing material according to conventional units, for examples lists of threes and sevens (numbers of Biblical and rhetorical significance), even the way that language is structured is seen to express the divine ordering. For example, following the

---

95 _la misc_, fol.149-50  
96 _Gebete_, Sunday matin p.236  
97 Other writers may repeat a stylistic device as an integral part of a prayer. For example, the cry ‘в лять мне’ punctuates the prayer ‘в сердцы и в гланию’ in the _Iaroslav miscellany_. The speaker exclaims, ‘в лять мне, как я сего! В лять мне, как сего я сего! В лять мне, как сего сего! (la misc, , fol.120v). Although Kirill often employs organizing devices, they are used with restraint so that one device rarely seems to dominate for long.
tradition of the Psalter, many of Kirill’s phrases occur in pairs. Recalling past penitents, Kirill employs three pairs of nouns, ‘поминаю славного и бдущего, и разбойника и мятежа, хулителя и отчаяния, их ж присноблажнны показа покаянья рад, да и мне каящаяся не прем’.

Both members of each pair reinforce each other so that the first pair is bonded by a common root, ‘бдящъ’, perhaps underlining the moral sin associated with the wayward woman and prodigal son. The second pair typify sins relating to money, and the third pair represents those who sin in word. Three and seven occur in the three pairs of penitents and in the seventh penitent who is the speaker - ‘и мне каящаяся’. By listing himself as the seventh penitent, this placing could point both to the extremity of his condition as the seventh sinner mentioned, and to the miracle of his salvation.

Pairs of words also add solemnity to the speaker’s invocation of the angelic hosts: ‘къ Ему, яко защитникъ и хранителя жизни моего, азъ оказаный и многоглазый (имя рекъ) припадаю, молясь и прось Ваших милости’.

The paired expressions of nouns, adjectives and verbs highlight the contrast between the angels as protectors, and himself as sinner and suppliant. In other examples, pairs of verbs and adjectives intensify and redefine each other. By juxtaposing the adjectives ‘Дрязгалъ и немощна’ Kirill compounds the misery and sluggishness implied by ‘Дрязгалъ’, with the frailty and infirmity of ‘немощны’.

Kirill also uses pairs of phrases which are syntactically parallel. The speaker’s plea for God to satisfy his hunger and his thirst with divine mercy and love, are concentrated by his use of the parallel phrases, ‘насыти хлебу мою отъ милости Твоея, напой жаждо мою отъ безчисленного чудесномилостиваго Твого’.

98 Gebete, Saturday hour, p.344
99 Gebete, Monday matin, p.248
100 Rozhdestvenskaia picks out the pair of verbs, ‘мирот и трудыше душе’. She suggests that by using the verb ‘трудыше’ in this context Kirill creates a new syncretic form which fuses the meanings of ‘to suffer’ and ‘to labour’ (Rozhdestvenskaia, ‘Некоторые особенности’, p.101).
101 Gebete, Thursday hour, p.309
The anaphoric use of the prefix ‘на’, and the symmetrical patterning of noun, possessive pronoun, followed by the preposition ‘от’, reinforce the parallel pleas. Associations of thirst and hunger, God’s love and his mercy, also strengthen the link between these phrases.

In another instance Kirill uses syntactic parallels to sharpen comparison. The speaker implores God not to send his anger so that he will not be like a moth-eaten garment or rusty iron, ‘Да не буди, яко риза, молимъ изъялена, и яко жалъко ржеть скончаваемо.’ Apart from ‘яко’ which begins both phrases, the parallel emerges in the ordering of nouns (‘риза’ and ‘жалъко’), the agent (‘молимъ’ and ‘ржеть’) and finally the passive verbal forms (‘изъялена’ and ‘скончаваемо’). The concurrence of moth and rust is expressed in Christ’s teaching, ‘do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume.’ In his prayer Kirill modifies the original context which referred to treasure, adapting the imagery in order to apply Jesus’ warning to himself, with the parallel form used to reiterate time’s decay. Once again Kirill is seen to intensify his material so that it has an immediate bearing on the speaker’s need to repent.

In the Thursday vesper prayer, pairs of words in syntactically parallel phrases magnify the gulf between the speaker’s desired spiritual condition and his present state. The speaker begins by describing himself as ‘весь нищъ, весь угожь безъ Твоей помощи, напраснень родомъ и свирепь естествомъ’. His complete spiritual poverty is underlined by the repetition of ‘весь’ followed by the familiar adjectives ‘нищъ’ and ‘угожь’. Dispelling an initial impression of humility, the adjective ‘напраснень’ introduces the theme of man’s inherent rebelliousness. Subsequent pairs are meshed together by the interplay of nouns ending in the dative singular ‘-u’, ‘похотникъ греху, злъ воинъ имыль, поминатарь злъ, забытникъ любы’. As if to emphasize his determined

---

102 Gebete, Monday hour, p.255
103 Matthew 6:19
104 All the quotations from this confession are found in Gebete, Thursday vesper, p.311.
pursuit of sin, the parallel rhythm is mirrored so that ‘здо’, the object of his desire, begins and ends the two middle phrases. By juxtaposing the opposites ‘поминателъ’ and ‘забытникъ’, ‘здо’ and ‘добро’ - the speaker underlines his propensity for evil and his indifference towards good. He then describes himself as ‘скорб на скор и на смиренье раскаянень, ревновь на гладь и на молитву ленивъ’. Short adjectives which convey energy and movement begin each clause (‘скорб’ and ‘ревновь’) while those describing his relation to spiritual virtues are placed tellingly at the end of each clause (‘раскаянень’ and ‘ленивъ’). Assonance is heard in the pair of words, ‘скорб’ and ‘снор’, ‘ревновь’ and ‘ленивъ’, further highlighting the battle between good and evil in the speaker’s experience.

Kirill uses alliteration where immediacy is of the moment. In expectation of fearful judgement, the speaker does not know when the earth will swallow him. The gaping earth is seemingly anticipated in the concentration of ‘з’ and ‘zh’, ‘когда ежедневь живая и живя пожреть мя’.105 Temporality and sin are signalled in one prayer by words which begin with ‘v’ and ‘b’, ‘время беззаконствую, аки песь впадающа на свой враговитни. И вся блага времена валиримъ’.106 Key words resonate throughout the Saturday hour prayer - the adjective ‘великій’ and the noun ‘величество’ - bringing to the fore a particular theme. They qualify the basis of his entreaty: first God’s miracles (‘на величество чудесъ Твоихъ взыраю’), second his mercy (‘пришем милости Твоей великой’), third the speaker’s faith (‘свъ великою верою’) and last God’s greatness. The crowning reference at the end of the prayer combines both the adjective and noun ‘велико величество Твое’. Kirill’s declaration, ‘Ты бо еси Христосъ сынь Божий, даи молитву молящимся, премя покаяніе каящихся’,107 occurs near the close of his Thursday matin prayer as a summation of Christ’s identity. The syntactic parallelism of the two phrases ‘даи молитву

105 Gebete, Friday matin, p.317
106 Gebete, Friday matin, p.314
107 Gebete, Thursday matin, p.306
the repetition of
the same root in each phrase and the half verbal rhymes ‘молящемуся’ and
‘кашш ambassadors’. This creates something of a circular effect so that prayer is seen
to originate from and return to God.

As well as pairs, Kirill clusters stories, words and clauses in triads. At sacred moments of history and at junctures which express a totality of experience, Kirill may introduce a triad. Three stories, as has been already noted, mark the sixth hour of his Sunday hour prayer, while three parables dramatize the imminence of judgement in the vespers prayer for that same day.\(^{108}\) In the Wednesday hour prayer the speaker underlines the depth of his anguish by a succession of three verbs, ‘Господь и спраси и пачалъ
уста заплакани’,\(^{109}\) a cry which is also echoed in his Tuesday vespers prayer.\(^{110}\)

The speaker’s anguished cry that God should not hand him over to Satan’s desire, occurs in the form of a triad, ‘Аа не буду причастникъ пагубъ, да не
сбератите устъ моихъ отъ славословія твоего и да не стану въ радость врагу’.\(^{111}\)

Confronted with the prospect of eternal darkness, the speaker uses a triad of phrases and, in the third phrase, a triad of adjectives to expose the full horror of such a prospect. In the eleventh hour he wants to come to Jesus, ‘даже непостижимо близко, даже недальность солнце, даже не обмануть мene мощь
страшная и трепетная и глушия тмa’.\(^{112}\) The threefold repetition of ‘даже’
heightens the urgency reflected in the oncoming night, referred to first as
the evening, then as the setting sun and finally the night. Darkness is the last
word and is qualified by adjectives of terror, which move the speaker from
an analogy of evening to the horror of spiritual darkness. Using an array of
different literary devices Kirill thus makes the spiritual content of his text

---

\(^{108}\) The three records are: the appearance of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection, his visit to
Zachaeus and his conversation with the Samaritan woman in the hour prayer. The three parables
in the vespers prayer are: the vineyard owner who hires workers until the eleventh hour, the
banquet and to the wise and foolish virgins.

\(^{109}\) Gebete, Wednesday hour, p.290

\(^{110}\) ‘Господь и спраси и пачалъ’ (Gebete, Tuesday vespers, p.283).

\(^{111}\) Gebete, Monday vespers, p.258

\(^{112}\) Gebete, Tuesday matin, p.275
more tangible and immediate. Language itself is seen to be a tool of spiritual experience.

Another way in which the invisible world is made palpable is in Kirill’s use of opposites. Antithesis was a popular rhetorical device in classical writing, and is often used in the Christian tradition to express the paradox of incarnation.113 Prayers frequently describe the spiritual world through opposites. Day and night, light and darkness and their correlation to the spiritual world, are contrasts which Kirill and other writers use with effect. Contrasts such as height and depth have an obvious analogy to the heights of heaven and the depths of sin. Kirill gives depth spatial dimension when he portrays himself as a geographical lowpoint, ‘ΑΛΛ ΕΙΣ ΧΩΜΕ ΑΡΧΗΤΕΛΖΕ ΕΚΤΙΜΕ ΖΑΛΗΜΕ ΔΑΜΟΤΕ’.114 Kirill’s appellation of the Theotokos as ‘ΖΕΜΝΟΣ ΗΞΟ’, ‘ΒΟΑ ΝΕΒΡΙΣΟΜΕΝΟ ΑΧΕΤΟΣ ΣΟΛ’, ‘ΖΕΦΣΔΑ ΝΕΖΑΡΗΩΜΑ’ encapsulates a meeting of the heavenly and earthly.115 For the speaker of Kirill’s prayers the spiritual choices are harrowing. His picture of the Day of Judgement visualizes both destinies; on the one hand, thunder, lightning and devouring fire ready to consume him and on the other, joy, worship and rest enjoyed by the righteous.116 By recalling such extremities, Kirill concentrates the speaker on the spiritual realm and the need for constant repentance.

Kirill is aware of how heavenly reality is mimicked by its sinful counterpart. For example, the speaker’s return is either to his heavenly home or to the land of eternal darkness.117 God wields a sword of anger, and sin too grips a deadly sword.118 In this way sin is seen to counterfeit the

113 See Faith Kitch’s chapter entitled ‘antithesis’ in The Literary Style of Epifanij Premudryj ‘pletenije slaves’, (Slavistische Beiträge 96), Munich, 1976, pp.98-110
114 Gebete, Tuesday matin, pp.274-5. Kirill’s reference to the physical contours of the earth prepares the reader for his subsequent depiction of his mind being earth-bound, ‘ΠΡΙΙΓΩΘΡΑΝ ΕΙΣ ΣΤΗ ΖΕΜΝΟΙ ΔΑΜΟΜΕ’ (p.275).
115 Gebete, Wednesday matin p.291
116 Gebete, Tuesday matin pp.275-6
117 As well as the return of the prodigal son, ‘ΒΕΖΩΡΑΚΙΝΙ ΚΑ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗ’ (Gebete, p.277), Kirill envisages a return to wrong ‘ΕΧΕΛΑΡΤΙΚΟΙ ΝΑ ΣΡΑΙΣ’ (Gebete, p.274) and a return to the land of darkness ‘ΔΑ Η ΒΕΖΩΡΑΚΙΝΗ ΕΠ ΖΕΜΝΟ ΤΙ ΖΕΜΝΗ’ (Gebete, p.256).
118 God’s sword, ‘ΜΕΝ ΣΩΤΗ ΕΧΕΛΑΡΤΙ’ (Gebete, p.249), is mirrored in the sword of sin ‘ΓΡΥΛΩΝΙΜΛ ΖΕ ΖΕΜΝΗ ΜΕ ΣΡΑΙΣ ΜΕ’ (Gebete, p.254).
heavenly realm. The contrast between the true image and its imitation is magnified by Kirill's use of similarity in dissimilarity. One noun describes both the multitude of his sins 'множеством' and the multitude of God's mercies 'множеством милости Твоей', once again expressions which can be found in the Psalter.\textsuperscript{119}

An interplay of words between the two spiritual realms avoids the petrification of extremes. The speaker learns by analogy and is placed in a position where opposites create dialogue. This principle is exemplified in Kirill's use of the word 'пучина'. In prayers this word commonly evokes the vast expanse of the sea as an image of desolation and destruction. The writer of the prayer 'на дни и н на мякости души' likens his plight to Pharaoh drowning in the sea's expanse, 'погребение в пучине морском, яко же тогда фараона в мори умертвевшему са телами его погребаются'.\textsuperscript{120} Such a fearful and vast element defies human comprehension, as man, engulfed by such an expanse, loses all sense of mastery and perspective. Kirill exploits such connotations when he uses the same noun to describe God's love and mercies. At the point when the speaker despairs of salvation, the horror of destruction is transformed into the awesome element of God's love. In four different instances the speaker sees judgement as imminent, at which point he makes his appeal to the depths of divine love. In one prayer the speaker visualizes Gehenna ready to gorge his blood and pleads for time to repent. He then reminds himself that God does not desire the death of sinners, but rather than complete the familiar quotation, he declares God's love, 'многомилостив и добр и милость Твою иисусову'\textsuperscript{121} When the speaker imagines how he may fall victim to Satan's boastful words 'Where is your God?', he replies: 'ты еси Бог мой и имеешь пучину чадь свою'.\textsuperscript{122} While other

\textsuperscript{119} Gebete, Sunday matin p.236 & p.239
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Ja mise}, fol.111v
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Gebete}, Monday hour, p.256
\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Gebete}, Monday vesper, p.258. Another reference to the expanse of God's love occurs after Kirill contemplates judgement with its consuming fire from heaven and gaping pit, 'священникъ по дмисяти и пучину чадь свою блюсти' (\textit{Gebete}, Monday matin, p.249). Near the end of his
writers also speak of the expanse of God’s love, Kirill uses the phrase with maximum dramatic impact.\textsuperscript{123}

Simplicity and spontaneity are merely beguiling features which appear on the surface of Kirill’s prayers. A whole range of different tools are employed in his craft, and the literary devices explored in this chapter merely touch on the ways that Kirill draws the suppliant into the text. To achieve this effect Kirill is seen to exploit traditional devices in five key areas; an awareness of time, the use of New Testament stories, the body, the ordering of language and contrast.

By approximating the time of the prayer with Biblical time, Kirill encourages the speaker to experience the prayers more intensely, expecting the same truths and parables to work in his life. Time is modelled on the speaker’s tangible experience of time passing, as a way of sharpening his awareness of spiritual realities. The use of past, present and future tenses is shown to highlight the perception of sacred time, crossing boundaries of past and future, and charting the uneven course of repentance. This simulates the changeable nature of experience in repentance rather than a more obviously schematic approach. By the use of parables and stories the speaker too is seen to experience the deepening night and Christ’s meetings with people at the sixth hour, expanding the more familiar remembrances of the eleventh hour and the hour liturgy.

The truth of the Gospel stories is seen to be ever-present and is applied to the speaker’s situation through allegory, symbolism and comparison. Kirill’s prayers are distinguished by the way incidents mesh together, creating a harmony of correspondences designed to draw the reader into the enduring truths of New Testament stories. Details from each

\textsuperscript{123} In a prayer attributed to John Chrysostom, the speaker declares ‘ifice τέρτους θυμάσθης, ἵνα ἴππος τοιχίας τείνης, ἵνα πεπαλαφοῖς καὶ ἀποδεκατήμας’ (la misc, fol.48).
story are selected and amplified according to the context. Significantly, Kirill tends to develop symbols so that they point to repentance.

In Kirill’s search for an additional means to express a dynamic relationship with God, he often uses parts of the body in a literal and metaphorical sense. Notably, the speaker focusses on the unworthiness of his lips, a critical instrument of prayer and language. Kirill organizes his prayers according to traditional patterns and numbers. Such ordering highlights the gulf between the opposing spiritual destinies, making the text more easily comprehensible, so that the structure of language also is seen as an expression of spirituality. Thus Kirill creates a spiritual landscape which is immediate and dynamic, constantly confronting the suppliant with spiritual extremities and opposites.

By employing a whole range of traditional literary devices and combining them in a dramatic and fresh way, Kirill calls the individual to see himself in relation to God, responding with heartfelt repentance. In this way Christian spirituality is seen to touch the core values of human civilization - the perception of time and reality, of people and of language - bringing them to the fore of the suppliant’s daily experience through a language of prayer. Kirill’s prayer cycle also underlines that the individual’s belonging is firstly to the heavenly world rather than to Rus’. In this respect, Kirill’s prayers say least about Rus’ as a nation, since their prevailing focus is not dependent on a locality or national events but on the otherworldly. Rather than resting on the security of Rus’ as a Christian country, Kirill’s prayers urge the individual suppliant to examine his position before God. In Kirill’s skillful use of language he is seen to encourage his fellow countrymen to experience spiritual reality more vividly than their immediate surroundings.
Conclusion

While limited to the texts of prayers spanning just under four centuries, a detailed reading of prayers sheds new light on the question of how nationhood and spirituality were perceived by the writers of this period, revealing a greater subtlety and variety in their perceptions than previously considered.

‘In the beginning was the word...’ points to the logos in St John’s Gospel and in the context of this study also highlights the Slavonic script as a prerequisite to the writing of prayers. The concept of the logos was pivotal to Cyril and Methodius’ mission conducted in the Slavonic language, and an appreciation of the logos characterizes the works written contemporaneous to, and following, the brothers’ missionary activity. Admiration for the verbal skills of the linguist, debator and teacher is also reflected in the literature of this period. In the Alphabetical prayer Konstantin’s repeated reference to the ‘word’ reveals a multifaceted understanding. As well as the Slavonic word of the prayer, Konstantin acknowledges the inspired word which explains spiritual truth, the expansive word and the word of the Gospel. Thus in seeking to make the Gospel word clear, Konstantin points to the logos. Konstantin’s prayer, together with his translations of sermons elucidating the Gospel stories, is seen to reflect a spirituality focussed on the Gospels.

When visibly endorsed by a nation’s rulers, religion is shown to form an important aspect of nationhood. Potentially it offered a unifying principle and a moral basis for national life, as well as affecting the way in which a nation related on an international level. Baptism was the expected sign of entry into the Christian community. In both the Alphabetical prayer and the accounts of Vladimir I’s conversion, baptism is seen as a watershed in the national life of Rus’, representing not just as a personal commitment but a decision taken on behalf of the nation. With baptism as the distinguishing mark of a Christian nation, it was important how Vladimir’s conversion and baptism was portrayed
in writings. The prayers inserted in the *Povest' vremennykh let* and in the third part of the *Pamiat' i pokhvala* indicate the problematic recounting of conversion and baptism. Surely the external sacrament must be seen to be accompanied by inner repentance. In the *Pokhvala*, Ilarion shows a process whereby Vladimir’s understanding is illumined from on high, so that his thinking leads him to baptism. Vladimir’s baptism is then described in theological terms with the miracle being his faith. In the third part of the *Pamiat' i pokhvala* the writer highlights Vladimir’s sanctity by including two prayers which underline the radical effect of repentance and baptism. Here the external circumstances of Vladimir’s baptism are played down. By contrast, the so-called Kherson legend recounted in the *Povest' vremennykh let* focusses on events leading to Vladimir’s baptism. Prayers are brief, and act as a spiritual highlighter in events otherwise blurred by pragmatic concerns. Tangible answers to Vladimir’s enquiries and prayers, such as his capture of Kherson, culminate in the miracle of healing at baptism. Although on one level Vladimir’s miraculous recovery of his sight at baptism encapsulates his inner spiritual transformation, on another it threatens to undermine the miracle of faith. While recognizing the different contexts of a eulogy and chronicle, a subtle shift in the perception of baptism is discernible, moving from an internal to an external event, an act inspired by faith to one forced by circumstance and tangible proof. The account of miraculous healing also conforms more closely to other Biblical patterns of conversion. An observable sign was naturally more appealing to the popular consciousness, offering an external badge of national life while also associating Vladimir with the miraculous, an element otherwise lacking in his conversion story. Whereas in the first decades of the mission to the Slavs, the Gospel word, and the faith it inspired, came to the fore, the Kherson legend shows the tension between faith which believes without seeing, and a spirituality which is expressed through visible acts.

From its inception as a Christian nation, power and religion are seen to work hand in hand in Rus’. In the Kherson legend Vladimir’s suit to Anna is
significantly strengthened by his threat of force against Constantinople. Prayers are seen to provide a counterweight to the role of politics and force which threaten to dominate. Later changes made to the prayers of the Kherson legend in the prolog accounts reflect the changing perceptions of Vladimir’s baptism and his relation to Byzantium. They portray both extremes - Vladimir as a resolute and believing convert, and Vladimir as aggressor and despoiler. The writer of the third part of the Pamiat’ i pokhvala organizes his account of Vladimir’s baptism so that might is not seen to achieve spiritual advantage, but rather power results from the depth of his repentance and inner transformation, evident in his two prayers of penitence. The pre-Christian image of a great warring nation is seen now in Christian terms as the converted nation which is rewarded with conquests.

In Ilarion’s Pokhvala and the chronicler’s account of the mass baptism, Vladimir’s threatening command appears to act as a lever to win spiritual gain. Was the baptism due to Vladimir’s forceful command, or to the people’s willing response, or a mixture of both? Whatever answer is given, the ordinary Kievan baptized in the river would have been struck not only by Vladimir’s ultimatum, but also by the inclusive nature of baptism. Baptism was a leveller that embraced all people regardless of gender, age or social standing. In the Alphabetical prayer Konstantin envisages those of every age, young and old, praising the Holy Trinity. Likewise in Ilarion’s prayer, intercession is made for men, women and children. Whatever disjunction may have existed between the outward rite of baptism undertaken by Vladimir and the people, and the inner understanding, baptism, whether performed willingly or by force, offered a powerful symbol of unity for the nation, one which is recognized as such in the prayers discussed above.

Rulers were central to the formation of a sense of nationhood in the Middle Ages. The Byzantine Empire had its own model of authority. In its own eyes it was the earthly reflection of the kingdom of God and therefore had only one throne - occupied by the emperor or on occasion emperors. Clearly there
was not room for two such empires in this plan. In Rus’ the chronicler reports that its rulers are descend from Riurik, thereby establishing a common genealogical line. The hand over of power from one prince to another, especially in Kiev, tended to be a precarious affair and Boris and Gleb’s glowing example of brotherly love and martyrdom was therefore of particular relevance to Rus’ during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. As well as pointing to an ideal for Christian rulers, it was fitting that martyrs should follow after the apostle-like Vladimir, since the Christian Roman Empire was founded first on apostolic teaching, before the land was sanctified by the martyrs’ blood. For Rus’, however, the martyrdom of the two brothers occurred in a different setting. Instead of facing the hostility of pagan rulers, Boris and Gleb were persecuted by their brother, who was motivated by personal ambition rather than by enmity towards the Christian faith. Thus from the rulers came both the persecutor as well as the supreme example of faith.

In the three narratives of Boris and Gleb’s martyrdom under consideration, prayers are shown to be instrumental in explaining the nature of their martyrdom, portraying different authorial perspectives. In the *Povest’ vremennykh let* Boris, and by extension Gleb, are depicted foremost as those who share in Christ’s suffering. This is evidently regarded as sufficient reason to justify their martyrdom. In the *Chtenie* Boris and Gleb’s prayers are full of pious sentiments, portraying an unshakeable faith in God’s sovereignty. By playing down the family relationships, Nestor emphasizes the priority of the spiritual model as being the determinant of a ruler’s behaviour. Nestor’s interpretation of *imitatio Christi* highlights Christ’s obedience to his heavenly father and his concern for the wider community. The princes are seen to be Christ-like in their saving mission, first as defenders of Rus’ against the pagans, and second, as men who sacrifice their lives for their countrymen.

In the *Skazanie* the writer interleaves two perspectives - that of brother and martyr - so that the Christian ideas of martyrdom and brotherly love are fused with the notion of loyalty to members of the ruling clan. Here the New
Testament meaning of ‘brother’ as fellow Christian is eclipsed by the literal meaning of blood-brother. In showing brotherly love and in not resisting Sviatopolk, Boris in the Skazanie is shown to be obey the words of Scripture, an obedience which is seen to validate his claim to martyrdom. The portrayal of Boris and Gleb’s suffering in their prayers also reveals an important aspect of their martyrdom, the heartache of a brother’s betrayal. In particular Gleb’s response to the news of family deaths and his appeals to his family, especially to Boris, stress the importance of family ties and the anguish wrongdoing causes. For an emerging Christian nation, the ethic of brotherly love, fused with the idea of clan loyalty, was a potent development, combining new and old ideas.

Vladimir Monomakh’s Pouchenie provides, in one sense, an epilogue to the accounts of Boris and Gleb’s martyrdom. His prayerful meditation composed of quotations from the Psalter assures the princes that they live in a moral universe where the righteous will enjoy ultimate victory and the wicked suffer final defeat. Even if the princes could view Boris and Gleb as shining examples of unattainable virtue, they could not easily deny that Monomakh’s instructions were directed at them.

Although all Christians were regarded as part of the universal Church, people tended to pray to those who had enjoyed secular or spiritual authority, or both, in their earthly life. A righteous death represented the high point of a saint’s life, when the earthly gave way to the divine and they were granted special access to intercede before God. Far from becoming remote and indifferent to earthly concerns, the righteous are seen to intercede actively on behalf of the living. The descendants of Vladimir I looked to Boris and Gleb not only as intercessors, but as ancestors. Monomakh, who keenly promoted the cult of his great-uncles Boris and Gleb, also appeals to his fathers’ prayers in the Pouchenie as a reminder of the Christian and familial bonding which should discourage interprincely feuding.
Answers to the questions of where Rus' came from and how it became Rus' underwent considerable revision following the adoption of a literary language and conversion to Christianity. Rus' now had a sacred history which could be traced back through the Old and New Testaments and the writings of the Christian tradition to Adam and Eve. In the Slovo o zakone i blagodati Ilarion interprets the history of Rus' through a theological framework, illustrating how the succession of law by grace was mirrored in the way the inclusiveness of Christianity is seen to supersede the exclusiveness of Judaism.

One question which naturally arose, was why the conversion of Rus' was so late in comparison with other Christian countries. Different angles are given in answer to this question by writers of eleventh and twelfth century Rus'. On the one hand, the chronicler's account points to the devil's rebellion before the creation of the world, which affected all humankind including Rus', with his defeat depicted in the Dnieper baptism. On the other hand, the prayers of Nestor's Chtenie emphasize God's sovereignty in all human affairs including the timing of the conversion of Rus'. The comparatively late conversion of Rus' was not seen to imply that Rus' was therefore inferior and Nestor argues in the Zhitie Feodosiia that Feodosii is such a radiant figure because he belonged to 'the last and weak generation'. He also points to the principle whereby the first shall be last and the last shall be first. Thus Rus' is considered not to be disadvantaged but on the contrary to sparkle more brilliantly in comparison with more established Christian countries precisely because of its late conversion.

In order to capture the new vision of Rus' as a Christian nation, Ilarion uses particular words and phrases in the Slovo o zakone i blagodati and the prayer which follows. As well as employing the title 'kagan' to describe the princes, Ilarion refers to 'zemlia' in such a way that the identity of the land fuses with that of the people. The prayer 'from our whole land' is seen to form an appropriate sequel to Ilarion's sermon and eulogy. In this setting the prayer can be regarded as a united response made by all the people who have entered
into a new relationship with God. The belonging of the people to the land, like the Old Testament notion of the Jews belonging to the Promised Land, is interpreted in the prayer as a sign of God’s blessing and favour. Exile and dispersal from their land is viewed as God’s punishment. Thus the perception of the ‘ruskaia zemlia’ as a people and territory becomes a national and theological concept in Ilarion’s work.

As well as land, Ilarion refers to the new people ‘liudie’ of Rus’, underlining their new identity as God’s people, a part of the universal Church. Ilarion’s prayer depicts their relationship with God as a dynamic encounter. Collective nouns and images employed in the prayer, such as a flock, an inheritance, and a people, suggest a united identity. That identity is also expressed in the intercessions. In the Synodal manuscript, intercessions are made for groups of people defined according to general roles or status. By contrast, the short redaction of the prayer, which also occurs in the liturgy for New Year, pays more attention to naming positions of hierarchy, and contains fewer collective terms. The introduction of intercessions for those departed also indicates a later perspective. By contrast, in the prayer of the Synodal manuscript the people are seen as a ‘new people’, whose concern is to be nurtured in unity of faith, where ruling structures are less prominent and developed.

The perception of the monasteries and the level of spiritual life practised by monks also appears to have contributed to an understanding of Rus’ as a Christian nation. While in general terms Rus’ was seen as a terra sancta, on a local level certain places came to be regarded as sacred through the power of intercession and by virtue of the lives and relics of holy men. This is particularly true of the Kievan Caves Monastery, which laid claim to Feodosii’s promise that those who were buried there would be saved. In Nestor’s portrayal of Feodosii’s life, he appears to distinguish heavenly reality revealed to human sight as result of the saint’s prayer from insubstantial visions (videnie). His opening picture in the Zhitie Feodosii is of Feodosii as mediator before God on
behalf of the monks. Later this role would be extended to all who sought his intercession. One motif of intercession is the prayer Feodosii was said to have composed for Simon, which was placed in his hands at the time of his death. This custom, reported to be unique to Rus’, is one which could be practised by everyone. As well as this custom, the Kievo-pecherskii paterik records a written testament attributed to Georgii, Simon’s son, who was now in Suzdal’, written for his descendants, assuring them of their right to be buried in the monastery grounds and reminding them of the importance of Feodosii’s intercession. With the day of reckoning looming large on the individual’s horizon, the tradition of intercession was sought both in holy places and in tangible written testimonies. By examining the same tales which occur in a number of sources, it appears that the early focus on Feodosii as intercessor is widened in the Kievo-pecherskii paterik to include Antonii and the monks already buried there, thus developing the perception of the Caves Monastery as a centre of effective intercession.

As expected, in the prayers repentance is seen to constitute an important element of Christian spirituality. If the conversion of Rus’ was perceived as occurring at the eleventh hour, then conceivably Rus’ was about to face the Day of Judgement. The prayers examined, however, do not reflect the sense that the whole nation was about to face the Last Day. On the contrary, the Alphabetical prayer and Ilarion’s prayer written at the early stages of Christian spirituality among the Slavs are marked by an awareness of their recent conversion with an accompanying tone of celebration. An eternity of praise awaits those to whom the word is revealed in Konstantin’s prayer. Likewise in Ilarion’s prayer, the people are conscious that they are comparatively ‘new’ and ‘little’, but nevertheless express confidence and hope in God’s forgiveness and salvation. Their repentance resembles that of a favourite child who is certain both of God’s mercy and yet aware of their own weakness. On an individual lay level, Vladimir I is depicted as converting dramatically from paganism to Christianity, a path no other ruler could follow since Rus’ was now an
Christian nation. Writing over a century later as a prince and layman, Monomakh is confident that the act of repentance will bring forgiveness, and that a righteous life will reap its due reward. The depictions of Vladimir’s conversion and Monomakh’s *Pouchenie* promote confidence in the double effect of repentance and a transformed life.

By contrast, the monastic perspective seen in Feodosii’s role of intercession and also in Kirill’s weekly prayer cycle, concentrates on the individual’s standing before God at the Day of Judgement. Naturally, repentance then becomes a constant concern. Kirill’s use of a number of literary devices to convey time, New Testament stories, the parts of the body, the ordering of language and opposites, impresses the immediacy of spiritual reality on the suppliant and therefore the urgency of repentance. Spiritual reality is seen to be more concrete than the natural world and founded on the enduring realities of Biblical truths. Neither the apocalyptic foreboding of later years, nor Russia’s perception of her saving role, dominate these prayers. What emerges, however, is an initial distinction between the monastic perspective, which shows greater concern for judgement on an individual basis, and a wider vision evident in the early prayers of the Slavs, which are marked by joy and confidence in God’s forgiveness.

The study of prayers within their literary context is also seen to be illuminating. In narrative and eulogistic writings, prayers are shown to portray different images of Vladimir, both as a repentant sinner who has been inwardly transformed through his baptism, and as a powerful prince who demands visible answers to prayer before he agrees to be baptized. An analysis of prayers in the three narratives about Boris and Gleb highlights the varied perceptions of their martyrdom, in particular those reflected in the *Skazanie* and the *Chtenie*. In terms of dramatic style and narrative order, prayers are also seen to make an important contribution. Likewise, motifs of intercession in the literature devoted to the Kievan Caves Monastery display a developing and complex tradition rather than a uniform perception. Here it appears that the
prayer of intercession for the deceased, previously attributed to Feodosii, is only part of that developing tradition and was not in fact written by him. Far from being dull and uniform, prayers are seen to function in a dynamic way in the context of narratives, reflecting at times shifting and varied perceptions of national figures and events.

The *Alphabetical prayer* and the prayer attached to Ilarion’s *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* can be viewed separately, or as an integral part of their wider literary context. By combining a textual and interpretative approach, a stronger case is made for seeing the prayers as belonging to their respective contexts from an early date. Interpreted through the perspective of the word/Word, the *Alphabetical prayer* can be considered as Konstantin’s petition that he might make the Gospel word plain, a desire which is further realized in his translation of the Gospel commentary. From a textual angle, the Synodal manuscript containing the *Alphabetical prayer* and Gospel commentary, is shown to be the most successful context, particularly when the arrangement of the introduction is compared with other manuscripts containing the prologue title, prayer and preface. However, there is also evidence to suggest that the Synodal manuscript has been changed to a greater degree than previously thought, a point which undermines the view that its earlier date necessarily means a more accurate text. Ilarion’s prayer can be viewed as an expression of the new Christian identity of Rus’ for all the people, a theme which complements his sermon and eulogy. Comparing the text of the prayer attached to the *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* with other manuscripts of the prayer, particularly of the short prayer, it reflects a more archaic level of language as well as preserving the patterning and logic of phrases apparently lost in other manuscripts. In addition, the different intercessions in the long and short prayer also point to the fact that the long prayer was written for an earlier period which was characterized by its image of a united and joyful people. While the prayers can not be shown conclusively to belong to these literary contexts, a
combined interpretative and textual approach gives a fresh perspective to old questions.

Vladimir Monomakh’s *Pouchenie* has been viewed as a randomly ordered miscellany of quotations, instructions and autobiographical records which lacks any inherent organizing principle. It has also been assumed that the extracts from the Psalter are arranged according to some form of psalmomancy. By examining the choice of verses and their ordering, the Psalter extracts can be seen to form a cogent argument for the principles of Christian behaviour which apparently motivated Monomakh’s refusal to conspire. If these extracts are arranged with care, then this implies that the rest of the work may not be so carelessly put together as has been argued. While it is impossible to determine the level of a writer’s intentionality, the ordering discerned in the *Pouchenie* by this study, questions past assumptions about the arbitrary nature of its composition.

Thus the prayers examined are seen to offer an interpretative key to the works in which they are set. Far from being stale and unoriginal, prayers provide a valuable source of material for examining emerging perceptions of nationhood and spirituality, touching on issues as fundamental as the language of a people, their rulers, their sense of national identity and history, and, representing an expression of their religion. Overall, this study would suggest that a reappraisal of the role of prayers in the literature of the Slavs is overdue.
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